Vol. XV Nos. 3—4

101

BULLETIN
OF THE
DECCAN COLLEGE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

December 1953—March 1954.

POONA

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND DIFFERENTIATION IN EMOLUMENTS

By

Y. B. DAMLE.

CONTENTS

		Pages.
	INTRODUCTION	1-12
CHAPTER I	FROM FEUDAL TIMES TO INDUSTRIALISM —1085 to 1760 A.D.	13-47
CHAPTER II	THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND AFTER—1760 to 1880 A.D.	48-67
CHAPTER III	MODERN PERIOD—IMPERIALIST ERA—1880 to 1939 A.D.	68-87
CHAPTER IV	INDIA BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BRITISH RULE—1500 to 1857 A.D.	88-109
CHAPTER V	THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BRITISH RULE AND AFTER—1858 to 1939 A.D.	110-137
CHAPTER VI	STUDY OF SOCIETY IN THE U.S.S.R.—A PLANNED SOCIETY—1917 to 1939 A.D.	138-164
CHAPTER VII	CONCLUSION	165-168
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	169-180

Issued on 16*th September* 1955.

Printed by Shri M. H. Patwardhan at Sangam Press Ltd., 383, Narayan Peth, Poona 2.
and
Published by Dr. S. M. Katre for the Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute, Yeravda, Poona 6.

306

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND DIFFERENTIATION IN EMOLUMENTS

By

Y. B. DAMLE

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF ARCHAEOLOGY
1075
26 AUG 1969
GOVT. OF MADRAS

INTRODUCTION

As very correctly pointed out by NORTH, "social differentiation is at once a chapter of general sociology and an approach to social psychology."[1] The very fact that the differences among human beings are socially recognised implies social stratification. Stratification implies division into higher and lower layers. We are interested in the relationship between the differences, for instance, in the relationship between the social differences, the economic differences, the political differences and the occupational differences.

It is customary to divide social differences into various categories. Thus it is said that the differences of function, differences of rank, differences of interest, differences of culture are "significant social differences."[2] Likewise, it is said that in the main society is stratified economically, politically and occupationally.[3] Obviously enough this classification of social differences into four significant types or that of stratification into three important forms is meant to clarify the proper nature of social differentiation and social stratification. Such classification does not imply fixity. All that is implied in such classification is that society is stratified. And the economic, the occupation, the political, etc., are the factors of social classification. The essence of social stratification is the "differential ranking of the human individuals who compose a given social system and their treatment as superior and inferior relative to one another in certain socially important respects."[4]

Now it may be legitimately questioned how this dichotomy of the higher and the lower or the superior and the inferior was brought about. The biological factor plays an important role in giving rise to the phenomenon. In fact NORTH had to admit that the biological factor cannot be neglected for the "biological variations provide a very great deal of foundation for social distinctions."[5] This is alright so far as the 'foundation' is concerned. But it fails to give explanation of later development. Here comes in the social factor. "Social organization has developed marked social distinctions when there has been nothing in the nature of the individual which would indicate why he should occupy the position assigned to him."[6] In elucidation of this it may be added that the norms upheld by the society in question play quite an important part in such division of the people into higher and lower or superior and inferior grades. If we analyze the actions of individuals for determining their

1. NORTH, C.C.—*Social Differentiation*, p. vii.
2. Ibid, p. 5.
3. SOROKIN, P.—*Social Mobility*, p. 12.
4. Talcott PARSONS.—"An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification"—"*The American Journal of Sociology*", Vol. XLV, No. 6, p. 841.
5. NORTH, C. C.—*Social Differentiation*, p. viii.
6. Ibid. p. 207.

position in the social system, it can be easily seen that their actions have to be analyzed with reference to the norms of action upheld by society. The actions have to be judged in the light of the normative pattern of the society. Thus it is possible to speak of moral system as the central factor in differential evaluation of persons.[7] Moral superiority would in that case bring 'respect' while its antithesis would cause 'disapproval', indignation and hence the lowering of the individual.

The correspondence between the stratification of society into higher and lower class does not always coincide with its stratification into higher and lower economically, politically, occupationally, etc. Though those who enjoy economic privileges usually enjoy political and occupational privileges too. The correlation is not always perfect.[8] The factors which bring about social classification are not directly responsible in the same proportion for the phenomenon. That is why it is very difficult to defiine the concept of 'social class' in precise terms, as we shall see later. It has to be admitted that a totality of factors is to be taken into account for the real understanding of the phenomenon of social differentiation.

Nonetheless we may try to find out the degrees of importance of the various factors concerned. But various people have tried to explain the phenomenon in entirely political or economic or occupational terms. Thus PLATO, AGRIPPA, SALLUSTIUS, VOLTAIRE, D'AETH, RAYNAL, GODWIN, BERNSTINE, to mention the more famous ones have tried to explain it in economic terms.[9] HELVETIUS, A. BAUER, BLONDEL, S. SIMON, etc., gave explanation in political terms.[10] TURGOT, K. BUCHER partly, G. SCHMOLLER, TAUSSIG and many others have tried to explain the phenomenon in occupational terms.[11] Such theories suffer due to their onesidedness and fail to give us adequate explanation of the phenomenon of social classification. It may be, however, correct to speak of the predominance of one factor in a particular period. For example, we may speak of the dominating role played by the economic factor in the later stages of the development of social organization. This is not to deny the importance of other factors. Thus "economic factors undoubtedly played a large part in forcing the transition from a regime of slavery to one of serfdom, although the position of the serf was still chiefly determined by the political factor in the form of military control."[12] Later on, however, the "economic and cultural factors became more powerful than the political in holding peoples together, and economic forces, therefore, secured a larger field for determining social differences."[13] The increasing hold of the economic forces in the determination of social differences can be easily seen in the various theories propounded. We shall state some of the important theories, which embody attempts to prove the dominance of economic forces.

7. Talcott PARSONS—"An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification"—"*The American Journal of Sociology*", Vol. XLV, p. 842.
8. SOROKIN, P.—*Social Mobility*, p. 12.
9. Ibid, p. 18.
10. Ibid, p. 18.
11. Ibid, p. 18.
12. NORTH, C. C.—*Social Differentiation*, p. 219.
13. Ibid, p. 219.

1075 26 AUG 1959

Since the development of systematic thinking on social problems, the minds of social philosophers have been engaged in finding out the relation between economic forces and social development in general. It would be wrong to suppose that Karl MARX was the pioneer in recognizing the importance of the economic factor. Right since ARISTOTLE we find recognition of the importance of economic factors.[14]

With the development of modern industry and commerce which date from the seventeenth century, economic forces came to play a role important enough to attract the attention of thinkers of social problems. "The intensification of the social question in the nineteenth century was largely responsible for the rise of a new type of materialism, the dialectical materialism of Karl MARX and ENGELS."[15] As a result of his careful investigations into the social and economic conditions of the people, MARX came to the conclusion that legal relations and political forms in a society, far from being self-dependent or expressions of the developing human spirit, are rooted in the material conditions of living. ENGELS is even more emphatic on the issue. For he maintains that "the causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in men's brains, not in Man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought not in philosophy but in economics of each particular epoch."[16]

Here are some of the main tenets of the doctrine of historical materialism. In the first instance the 'sum total of the relations of production' constitutes the economic structure of a society. And the whole culture complex is founded in these 'relations of production.' Inevitably it follows that the whole culture complex is conditioned by the economic structure. Thus "property relations are the formal expressions or signs of these social relations of production."[17] Naturally society comes to be divided into two main classes, those who own property and those who merely toil". "The stratifying principle consists in the ownership, or the exclusion from ownership, of means of production such as factory buildings, machinery, raw materials and the consumers' goods that enter into the workman's budget. We have thus, fundamentally two and only two classes, those owners, the capitalists, and those have-nots who are compelled to sell their labour, the labouring class or proletariat."[18] Thus Karl MARX has viewed all social phenomena and social development mainly from the economic point of view.

Achille LORIA, an illustrious Italian scholar and an eminent social theorist, argues that the basic foundations of society are purely economic. He contends that economic factors played the decisive role in later social development, especially since the advent of industrial capitalism. The "connective institutions of morality, law and politics" are dominated by the economic factor. Thus it is that we find the presence of two classes of population in every society. Of the two distinct classes "one

14. Sydney HOOK—"Materialism" in the *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. X, p. 209.
15. Ibid, 209.
16. Ibid, p. 215.
17. Ibid, p. 217.
18. SCHUMPETER, J. A.—*Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, p. 15.

class lives without working, the other works without living."[19] Capitalistic property attains control over the 'connective institutions' in order to maintain its power. In fact "the law is derived from economic conditions......the law is also a monopoly of wealth, and in the Temple of Themesis there is no place reserved for the labourer."[20] Further the possession of property enables the maintenance of political power so that legislation which is favourable to the propertied class alone obtains. Thus economic conditions form the basis of politics. A vicious circle par excellence is thus created.

Werner SOMBART goes so far as to call this age the 'Economic Age'. According to him the economic and the so-called material import have gained supremacy over all other values. Thus not even cultural activity is left free from the impress of the economic import. The economic import is permeating our life so much "that in public life there is but one basis and measure of success, that of wealth in money; and only one order of rank, that of money or income."[21]

VEBLEN, who has become famous for his thesis of the Leisure Class, takes it for granted that this is purely an economic age where all other values have been out-stripped by the economic values. "The institution of a leisure class is the outgrowth of an early discrimination between employments, according to which some employments are worthy and others unworthy."[22] Exploit has always been considered as honourable. Day-to-day work has always been classed as unworthy. In the economic age employments have come to be divided into pecuniary and industrial activities. This distinction corresponds to the old distinction between exploits and day to day work. Activities which have to do with acquisition or ownership are classed as pecuniary activities. Day-to-day activities which have to do with labour and production are styled as industrial activities.

Ownership forms the immediate function of the leisure class. Then follow acquisition and accumulation of wealth. Naturally enough "employments fall into a hierarchical gradation of reputation. Those which have immediately to do with ownership on a large scale are the most reputable."[23] Next to these in reputability stand those which have indirectly to do with ownership such as financeering, banking, law, etc. The occupations which satisfy secondary needs are classed higher than those which satisfy lower needs. Manual labour is treated with contempt. All this amounts to isolation of the poor. Social standing is thus determined by the nature of employment. And employments which can be classed as pecuniary are alone treated as worthy. Consequently, economic affluence alone means high social standing. Economic force thus reigns supreme in determining social differences.

Gunnar LANDTMAN, discussing wealth as the factor making for social differentiation, states that "it is in conjunction with the dissimilarity of individual endowments that inequality of wealth has conduced to

19. Achille LORIA—*Economic Foundations of Society*, p. 86.
20. Ibid, p. 114.
21. Werner SOMBART—*A New Social Philosophy*, p. 22.
22. Thorstein VEBLEN—*The Theory of the Leisure Class*, p. 8.
23. Ibid, p. 231.

the rise of social differentiation. As a matter of course the difference as regards property in many cases goes hand in hand with difference in personal qualities...... But property has at the same time given to social differentiation a stamp of its own in distinction from that depending on purely personal traits of character........difference in property renders the grouping of classes far more permanent than would be the case under the influence of personal superiority or inferiority alone."[24] Wealth is such an important factor that the possessor of wealth is at an advantage over others. Thus the rich are elevated to the privileged rank while the poor are degraded. "It is noticeable that wealth in many cases constitutes a condition for nobility and is sometimes even rated higher than noble descent."[25]

Harold J. LASKI maintains that political equality can be of no avail unless accompanied by economic equality, for classes are determined by wealth. The very fact that the principle of 'cash nexus' was the guiding principle, made for the weakness of society. "It broke down the principle of birth as the foundation of privilege and replaced it with the principle of wealth."[26] Birth no longer determines status, unless accompanied by possession of substantial wealth. Hence acquisition of wealth has become the "Central principle of social organisation."[27]

R. H. TAWNEY maintains that wealth enables men to attain high social standing through the opportunities it affords. The inevitable consequence of this is that those without wealth have just to labour. Where the system of property operates it is futile to ask for equality of rights. Equality of rights, even if established would cease to function owing to "unequal powers springing from the exercise of equal rights in a world where property and the inherited wealth and the apparatus of class institutions have made opportunities unequal."[28]

It can be very easily seen that the most common feature of the theories stated above is the general relationship between economic forces and social classification. Further these theories hint at correlation between social standing and economic position.

We cannot, however, be satisfied with such general treatment of the problem. For us the problem assumes a much more specific form. Thus our problem is to find out the interrelationship between social differentiation and differentiation of economic emoluments. To be able to do so we proceed to study the interrelation between social status and remuneration received for work. In doing so we are mindful of the factor of skill, which comes in to explain adequately why particular remuneration is paid for a particular kind of work. Thus our problem is at once threefold. We have to work out the interrelation between social status, skill and the occupational position resulting therefrom, and remuneration.

It may be said in passing that in so far as we try to do this, we are treading a new path. We have noted how the various theories embody efforts to establish relationship of a general nature between economic

24. Gunnar LANDTMAN—*The Origin of the Inequailty of the Social Classes*, p. 68.
25. Ibid, p. 76.
26. LASKI, H.J.—*Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*, p. 313.
27. Ibid, p. 314.
28. TAWNEY, R.H.—*The Acquisitive Society*, p. 40.

forces and social classification. Hence our endeavour to attain precision in the interrelationship between social status and remuneration. Secondly, the cognizance taken by us of the factor of skill attempts to fill the lacuna so far inherent in the various theories to explain the interrelationship between social status and wealth. It is true that the factor of ability has been stressed by previous writers in accounting for social differentiation. For instance Gunnar LANDTMAN, C. C. NORTH, and R. H. TAWNEY admit the importance of the factor of ability in making for social differences.[29] But no systematic attempt has been made to work out the correlation between skill and social status, though general relation is pointed out. But that would not serve our purpose.

In order to be able to study the problem we choose three different societies. It is proposed to study the English society, the Indian society and the society of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic. A word about the period under review will immediately prove the rationality or rather the advisability of our choice. As far as the English society is concerned, we start right from the feudal times and proceed as far as the beginning of the last World War. In the case of the Indian society we start from the reign of Akbar, though proper cognizance shall be taken of the impact of earlier civilizations. The lower limit is of course the beginning of the last World War. In the case of the society of the U.S.S.R. we start right since its establishment, though of course the background of the same will be studied properly, and proceed as far as the year 1939. It can be very easily seen that our choice of societies and periods makes our study fairly representative of the various important social systems which have prevailed. Our study of the English Society from feudal times to modern times brings out the relevant features of capitalism. Our study is intended to bring out the impact of capitalist system on social relationships, right from the development of capitalism to its decline. Thus we study the development from 'status' to 'contract'. The study of the Indian society is intended to bring out the special features of a society which has been subject to diverse influences. The Indian society presents mixed system, which is at once medieval and modern. The decline of capitalism and the widely felt necessity of economic planning in order to stabilise social system, necessitates on our part the study of the society of the U.S.S.R. And it is the study of these varied systems which helps us to discount the special effects on the relationship of the peculiar features of a social system.

Before we proceed to the set task, we propose to define some of the important terms and concepts to be used. Strictly speaking the term 'social differentiation' is used to signify the fact that "social organization has developed marked social distinctions when there has been nothing in the nature of the individual which would indicate why he should occupy the position assigned to him."[30] As SOROKIN puts it, "social stratification means the differentiation of a given population into hierarchically superposed classes........ Its basis and very essence consist in an unequal distribution of rights and privileges, duties and responsibilities,

29. C.f. Gunnar LANDTMAN—*The Origin of the Inequality of the Social Classes;* C. C. NORTH—*Social Differentiation;* R. H. TAWNEY—*Equality.*

30. NORTH, C.C.—*Social Differentiation*, p. 207.

social power and influences among the members of a society."[31] As we have noted earlier the essence of social stratification lies in the "differential ranking of the human individuals who compose a given social system and the treatment as superior and inferior relative to one another in certain socially important respects."[32] It may be said that the two terms are more or less synonymous. The mere fact of differences between individuals does not warrant the use of the term 'social differentiation'. Society, as we have noted, develops or creates differences between individuals and assigns positions to various persons even when they are not warranted by the merits of the persons. It is only in this sense possible to speak of hierarchical status as ascribed.[33] Whether the position occupied by an individual is ascribed or not the signal fact remains that social differentiation implies ranking of people into high and low.

Now we shall see what distinguishes a higher class from a lower class. Without probing deep into the history of social classes, it can be said that the distinction is less easy to make in a modern society, what one may call a social class society, than it is in a feudal society. A social class presupposes a largely mobile society. It was since the growth of individualism, which happens to coincide with the development of industrialism, that society attained mobility. Individualism stresses the necessity of freedom of competition. For "it believes that different individuals have different aptitudes and that each should be allowed to develop them in competition with others to the best of his ability."[34] It was only after the acceptance of individualism as a creed that intelligent and painstaking men could rise in the social scale. For under feudalism individuals had no freedom of action. Very birth decided the status of a person. During the sway of Mercantilism the freedom of action of the individual was restricted by the operation of monopoly in trade and industry. That is why H. M. ROBERTSON maintains that "the spirit of individualism spreads mainly as an effect of trade development."[35] On the other hand it could as well be said that the economic system was developed in such a way that the "basic ethic which emphasizes individual achievement"[36] could continue to obtain.

And this transition from feudalism to social class society has meant that there is even less correlation between the social stratification and the economic, the political and occupational stratification. So great is the lack of correlation that many writers find the concept of 'social class' very vague and some even avoid it. For instance, Talcott PARSONS points out that there is "a certain vagueness in the actual scale of stratification so that it is only in a relatively rough and broad sense, not in a precise and definite one, that a given individual or family is placed relative to others. There is a relatively broad range of the standard of living where any one with a certain minimum of income can participate with-

31. SOROKIN, P.—*Social Mobility*, p. 11.
32. Talcott PARSONS—"An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification"—*The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XLV, No. 6, p. 841.
33. Ibid.
34. ROBERTSON, H.M.—*Aspects of the rise of Economic Individualism*, p. 34.
35. Ibid, p. 206.
36. Op. cit. Talcott PARSONS, p. 857.

out having the question of his exact relative status raised."[37] In fact there "is the relative lack of integration as between the different structures within the broader society."[38] This lack of integration seeks to explain why the discrepancy between income and occupational status does not lead to too great a strain on society. In fact it is "the vagueness of our class structure" which "provides a kind of cushioning mechanism".[39] SOROKIN avoids the use of the term.[40]

Messrs. CARR-SAUNDERS and Caradog JONES, in their excellent study of the social structure of England and Wales, classify the population according to sex, occupation, wealth, industry, inborn qualities, etc. But they are very doubtful about the existence of social classes. And the reason of their being doubtful is "that no measurable characteristic exists which allocates the population into social classes."[41] Further they maintain that it would amount to "a misreading of the social structure of this country to dwell on class divisions" namely the traditional class divisions of the upper class, the middle class and the lower class, in view of the fact that in many important respects such as dress, speech, use of leisure, etc. resemblance is coming to be attained amongst all members of the community.[42]

MAX WEBER, eminent German sociologist, discusses elaborately the concept of class in general. He speaks of three types of classes, namely (1) property class, (2) acquisition class, and (3) social class. Thus he distinguishes between social class and the other two types of classes. A class is a 'property class' when class status for its members is primarily determined by the differentiation of property holdings. A class is an 'acquisition class' when the class situation of its members is primarily determined by their opportunity for the exploitation of services on the market. The "social class" structure is "composed of the plurality of class statuses between which an interchange of individuals on a personal basis or in the course of a generation is readily possible and typically observable."[43] Thus it is very difficult to determine exactly the characteristics of a social class. Since there is no correspondence between the statuses in different classes "the unity of 'social' classes is highly relative and variable."[44] He also despairs of an exact definition of a 'social class'.

Morris GINSBERG expresses similar views when he discusses a very different criterion for determining social class. "The difficulties of classification are due among other things to the fact that social differentiation is psychologically conditioned and that as yet there exists no generally accepted technique for the observation, analysis and record of the behaviour of social groups in relation to one another. When psychological

37. Ibid, p. 859.
38. Ibid, p. 860.
39. Ibid, p. 861.
40. SOROKIN, P.—*Social Mobility*, Note 2, p. 18.
41. A. M. CARR-SAUNDERS and D. Caradog JONES—*A Survey of the Social Structure of England and Wales* (2nd Edn. 1937, Oxford), p. 67.
42. Ibid, p. 67.
43. Max WEBER—*Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, p. 390.
44. Ibid, p. 391.

analysis has been attempted at all, it has generally been in the direction of determining the ends or interests which classes have in common, with the result that writers have tended to deny the reality of class distinctions or to minimise them, in cases in which it was not possible to point to definite cohesive groups clearly aware of their interests as groups. But social classes are not associations to be defined by their ends or purposes."[45]

Exactly similar argument is advanced by Dr. COX. Instituting a comparison between political class and social class, he writes that "the political class is a power group which tends to be organized for conflict; the social class is never organized for it is a concept only."[46] No solidarity is possible to be attained in the case of a social class since it has no fixed members. There is a constant shifting of population from above and below.

All the while we have been busy pointing out the difficulties involved in arriving at the definition of social class. Yet, taking a hint from SOROKIN, we can say that no definition of social class can afford to omit any of the aspects mentioned. It is a totality of these aspects which makes a social class. "The best possible definition of social class is the totality of the people who have a similar position in regard to occupational, economic and political status."[47] Or as GINSBERG puts it, "social classes may be described as portions of the community, or collections of individuals, standing to each other in the relation of equality, and marked off from other portions by accepted standards of inferiority and superiority."[48]

For, though social class is not organized, there exists a strong psychological bond among different members of a class. This bond is of a vague nature. Only under certain conditions a kind of class-consciousness is aroused. It is really very difficult to describe exactly what is meant by such class consciousness. Morris GINSBERG gives us a clear analysis of the same. "There is firstly a "feeling of kind" as it may be called, in relation to members of one's own class, a confidence that one can meet them on equal terms. There is, secondly, a feeling of inferiority in relation to those above in the hierarchy, and, thirdly a feeling of superiority in relation to those below."[49] It is only in relation to dealing with members of other class that a feeling of class consciousness is aroused.

The concept of social class presupposes a hierarchical society. The presence of social hierarchy is an integral part of the concept. For "by class is meant two or more orders of people who are believed to be, and are accordingly ranked by the members of the community, in socially superior and inferior positions."[50] The concept of social class is a device to divide people into a hierarchy of statuses. "From the point of view

45. Morris GINSBERG—"Interchange Between Social Classes"—*The Economic Journal*, Vol. XXXIX, December 1929, p. 554.
46. COX, Olived Cromwell—*Caste, Class and Race*, p. 154.
47. SOROKIN, P.—*Social Mobility*, Note 2, p. 18.
48. Morris GINSBERG.—*Sociology*, p. 159.
49. Morris GINSBERG—"Interchange Between Social Classes"—*The Economic Journal*, Vol. XXXIX, December 1929, pp. 554-55.
50. WARNER and LUNT—*The Social Life of a Modern Community*, p. 82.

of the individual the class system may be thought of as a hierarchy of conceptual, social status frontiers."[51]

The question of social status is most inextricably bound with that of social class. "A status, in the abstract is a position in a particular system........ However, unless the term is qualified in some way, the status of an individual means the sum total of all the statuses he occupies. It represents his position with relation to the total society."[52] Social class brings about conceptual segregation of people into various groups of status. When it is said that a person belongs to such and such a class we get only a general idea about his status, economic, occupational or political. But when we are told about a person's status we can immediately place him in the proper class. For by status is meant his position in relation to total society. As very pertinently pointed out by Talcott PARSONS, "position in a scale of stratification is only one aspect of status."[53]

A person's status is determined by what he does and by the social estimation of his acts. Much depends on the attitude of the society concerned. "A person's status in a group has a double aspect. On the one hand, it rests in the mind of his associates, since it is the way they treat him and consider him. On the other hand, status is registered in the mind of the individual himself, as a reflection of how he stands in the eyes of others."[54]

Thus it is that the actions of an individual "must to a large degree be oriented to the scale of stratification."[55] That is why we can speak of social status as resting on certain stable factors. Wealth, education, ability, family connections, etc., are some of the important determinants of social status. This is universally acclaimed, though of course it is known that the variation in the proportion of these factors makes for variation in the status grades. Thus Talcott PARSONS notes that, though there is a wide range of variation in the 'content of the scale of stratification', it is possible to enumerate the 'bases of differential valuation', which are as follows :—(1) Membership in a Kinship Unit, (2) Personal qualities, (3) Achievements, (4) Possessions, (5) Authority, and (6) Power.[56] Max WEBER says that the term social status is used to signify the presence or otherwise of privilege in respect of social position. And it is determined by the mode of living, formal education, prestige of birth, or of an occupation.[57]

The possession or otherwise of certain privileges is a good indicator of one's social class. NORTH defines social class as "the term applied to a section of population, other than an age or sex group, distinguished by a peculiar status with respect to rights and privileges."[58] Not that this is the only difference between classes. But other differences like

51. Cox Iliver Cromwell—*Caste, Class and Race*, p. 304.
52. Ralph LINTON—*The Study of Man*, p. 113.
53. Op. cit. Talcott PARSONS. Footnote 11, p. 849.
54. E. T. KREUGER and Walter RECKLESS—Social *Psychology*, p. 83.
55. Op. cit. Talcott PARSONS. p. 847.
56. Ibid, pp. 847-49.
57. Max WEBER—*Social and Economic Organization*, pp. 393-94.
58. NORTH, C.C.—*Social Differentiation*, p. 25.

those of wealth, education, occupation, etc., hinge on the possession or otherwise of rights and privileges. And in this world of ours and more so this being an 'economic age' to use the celebrated expression of Werner SOMBART, rights and privileges have come to be mainly economic.

All this is clearly evinced by the various schemes of classification of population adopted. Thus the scheme of classification adopted by Morris GINSBERG in his study of 'interchange between social classes', though prima facie comprehensive, rests actually on economic factors. He distinguishes the following categories: Class I includes professionals, employers I, own account I; Class II includes employers II, own account II, salaried; Class III includes wage earners, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled.[59] In fact the same author opines, in his later work that "the primary determinants of social stratification in modern communities are unquestionably economic. It is economic conditions which for the most part determine the kind of education an individual is likely to receive and consequently the range of occupations open to him. Occupation in turn is a fair index of a man's mode of life, and of his general social standing."[60]

Discussing the factors responsible for changes in the class structure of English society, D'AETH opines that two factors have been responsible for the changes. "The first is the economic development of society; the second is the movement towards democracy."[61] About the first he says: "ever a potent force in human affairs, the economic factor today dominates society. Four results of economic development need to be noticed........ First, the large number and varied nature of occupations which have been occasioned. Secondly, the scope for development and rise in position within a single occupation. Thirdly, the demand for economic ability which has been created. By this expression is meant ability which has a wage value. Fourthly, the formation of large towns."[62]

DICKINSON adopts a scheme, similar to that adopted by Morris Ginsberg, though he uses the word 'group' instead of 'social class'. According to him it is the size of income and its source which determines these groups. The Groups are: (1) "Upper class: deriving income almost exclusively from property and large-scale enterprise; large owners of property (land or securities) and industrial magnates, exceptionally gifted artists, writers and professional men. (2) Upper Middle Class: drawing income from property, enterprise and intellectual labour; small property owners, proprietors of moderatesized (usually competitive) businesses, averagely competent members of the learned professions and public services. On the whole this group is composed of those who reasonably hope to reach the £1000 a year mark but not to pass much further. (3) Lower Middle Class: composed of petty property-owners (who must usually work as well as own), owners of small business and persons performing intellectual work not requiring much training or responsibility, typical members being clerks and small shop-keepers.

59. Morris GINSBERG—"Interchange Between Social Classes"—*Economic Journal*, Vol. XXXIX, p. 555.
60. Morris GINSBERG—*Sociology*, pp. 161-62.
61. D'AETH—Present Tendencies of Class Differentiation"—*Sociological Review*, Vol. III, No. 4. 1910, pp. 267-76.
62. Ibid, pp. 267-76.

(4) Skilled Working Class: drawing income from work and not at all, or only to a small extent from property, composed of persons performing work that, though not usually reckoned intellectual, requires skill (acquired by vocational training), mental alertness and responsibility. (5) Unskilled Working Class: drawing income entirely from work and unspecialised, unskilled labour at that,........a residual group including not only unskilled workers, but the failures and economic misfits of society, a category into which a skilled worker is easily thrown by sickness, ill-luck, etc."[63]

Dr. Newell Leroy SIMS introduces what may appear to be an altogether new theory of social classes. He studies industrial society, which renders feasible the accumulation of a large surplus. Moreover industrial society is largely mobile. Hence there ensue various degrees of individuality. And the degree of individuality "varies with the extent of participation in the surplus, from aggressive non-conformity, striving after uniqueness, and almost complete isolation to the weakest sort of self-hood, well nigh negative sense of independence, and a real fear of being distinct, or in anywise at variance with the customary and formal."[64] On this basis people are divided into three classes. In the first class are included "those who have large surplus at their command".[65] Naturally enough, they comprise the aristocracy and the leisure class. Individuality is very highly developed among them. In the second class stand those who have economic independence. It is customary to style them as the middle class. Having a limited control over surplus, their liberty suffers from certain restrictions. In the third and the lowest class are those who are dispossessed. They are economically dependent on upper classes. The development of individuality is very poor in this class. The author's introduction of the basis of individuality is certainly an innovation. But it can be very easily seen that the main thesis does not differ in its essentials from that of economic basis of classification.

A word about the method we follow, in studying the problem may not be uncalled for. We decided to make it a table work on more than one ground. In the first instance even a theoretical study of the problem was not available from which we could have derived considerable guidance. Secondly, our study relates to a very wide field. Actually we have to cover the entire gamut of social relationships through the working of socio-economic processes. Naturally the idea of doing field work was abandoned for reasons of expediency. Further we propose to discuss conditions till the commencement of the last World War. We have to do so in view of the significant alterations wrought by the war in the socio-economic set up, of which it is very difficult to take proper cognizance in view of its freshness. It is advisable to judge processes coolly and dispassionately. And times are not propitious for doing so as far as the War and its aftermath are concerned. Remoteness in time enables cool judgment. Hence our study will be restricted to the pre-war period.

63. DICKINSON, G.L.—*Institutional Revenue*, pp. 149-50.
64. Newell Leroy SIMS—*Society and its Surplus*, p. 293.
65. Ibid, p. 299.

CHAPTER I

FROM FEUDAL TIMES TO INDUSTRIALISM

Plan Of The Chapter :

(I) The necessity to study feudal conditions as well as the Guild System before starting the study of conditions prevailing under Industrial Capitalism proper.

(II) Social stratification and differences in economic conditions operating under feudalism.

(III) The decline of feudalism.

(IV) Social differentiation and differentiation in emoluments prevailing under the Guild System.

(V) March of Capitalism.

I

It has been stressed emphatically in the introductory chapter that our study of the problem viz., Social Differentiation and Differentiation In Emoluments must start from a particular period, since when industrial capitalism has been the characteristic feature of English Society, if it is to have any bearing on the living conditions. Persistent thinking of the problem has, however, proved the inadvisability of adopting such a course. For the working of social and economic forces is so intricate that every social and economic event, however important it may be, has its roots deep into the past. In fact we should rather adopt the term process to signify any social or economic event.

"No period of history, it is said, is ever made of whole cloth".[1] And that is why we shall have to consider the historical gathering of forces which brought to the forefront the phenomenon of industrial capitalism. Though the culmination was reached in a particular period of time, we should not be oblivious of the working of forces in that direction for a very long period. Thus some of the characteristics of capitalism were present even before the word itself was used. They say that the 'proof of the pudding is in eating'. Similarly the proof of the fact that some of the characteristics of capitalism were present long before it was known as a system lies in the diversity of the definitions of capitalism. SOMBART was one of the earliest to define capitalism systematically. "SOMBART has sought the essence of capitalism, not in any one aspect of its economic anatomy or its physiology, but in the geist or spirit that has inspired the life of a whole epoch. This spirit is a synthesis of the spirit of enterprise or adventure with the 'bourgeois spirit' ".[2] According to SOMBART the requisites of capitalistic order are freedom from regulation, functioning of an exchange economy, higher production and private enterprise.[3] Now according to this definition we can trace

1. Maurice DOBB: "*Studies In The Development Of Capitalism*". p. 1.
2. Ibid, p. 5.
3. Werner SOMBART: 'Capitalism', *Encyclopaedia Of Social Sciences*, Volume III., p. 197-99.

back the development of capitalism to a very early period for instance even in "classical Rome and Greece". According to Max WEBER the "industrial provision for the needs of a human group" the production of which is being carried out by the "method of enterprise" is an essential prerequisite of capitalism. He further described the spirit of capitalism as the 'attitude which seeks profit rationally and systematically'.[4]

There is another definition of capitalism "which virtually identifies capitalism with the organization of production for a distant market".[5] DOBB attributes this notion to the German historical school, which distinguished between 'natural economy' and 'money economy'. That was a time when money was just encroaching on 'natural economy'. Hence someone has described capitalism as a system under which the source of earning income is 'wealth other than land'.

The definition given by MARX has been very popular and is considered as one of the most scientific definitions. MARX "sought the essence of capitalism neither in a spirit of enterprise nor in the use of money to finance a series of exchange transactions with the object of gain, but in a particular mode of production. Thus capitalism was not simply a system of production for the market—a system of commodity production as MARX termed it—but a system under which labour-power had 'itself become a commodity' and was bought and sold in the market like any other object of exchange".[6] Legal compulsion was not, however, there. Its place had been taken by free-contract. This definition of capitalism approximates to conditions resulting under the functioning of Industrial capitalism.

The diversities in the definitions stated above bring home an important point, namely, that the development of capitalism has been a very long drawn out process. Many elements of capitalism were present much prior to the proper functioning of capitalism as a system.

Evolution is par excellence the cardinal principle of social development. It is generally considered that under feudalism the main activity of the people was the tilling for the lord of the land and that there was no 'production for the market'. The wealth of research that is available to us disarms us of the misconception. We know for certain that trading activity was carried on, though insignificant in volume, by the guilds. The guilds had infiltrated the feudal system. No doubt that the rise of money economy gave it a fatal blow. We shall deal with this at a later stage, however. The guilds in course of time came to be the trading monopolies. The guilds over-did it so much as to cause public resentment which brought in measures to restrict their power. Then comes free trading, indirect production and the estrangement between the worker and master. Inventions only accentuated the growth of this tendency thus bringing about complete divorce between the producer and the owner. This is just a brief review of history from feudalism to Industrial Capitalism, the details of which will be studied a little later.

Under feudalism the society was divided into two broad divisions the lords and the villiens. The lords had the supreme power over the

4. Maurice DOBB: *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 5.
5. Ibid. p. 6.
6. Ibid. p. 7.

villiens. Under the guild system another class of people came into being namely that of independent traders. They were not servile. Actually in course of time they came to wield considerable influence in society. We know that they took undue advantage of their position and hence came into disrepute. With the disruption of the guild system comes in the capitalist par excellence bringing in his wake freedom of enterprise, freedom of contract, production for the market, etc. In short the people become henceforth legally equal.

The brief review of economic and social conditions under feudalism, the guild-system and capitalism brings to our notice the concurrence of events. Thus social freedom seems to be travelling together with the economic.

II

Our study starts from the *Doomsday-Book*, for it was since the Norman conquest that England achieved unity which it did not possess prior to that. William the conqueror on being enthroned in 1085 had a discussion with his 'wise men'. "The outcome of that speech was the mission throughout all England of 'barons', 'legates', or justices charged with the duty of collecting from the verdicts of the shires, the hundreds and the vills of a descripto of his new realm. The outcome of that mission was the descripto preserved for us in two manuscript volumes, which within a century after their making had already acquired the name of Doomsday Book".[7] MAITLAND regards the *Doomsday Book* as 'an unique account of feudalism'.

The very nature of the plan adopted to carry out the survey reveals the feudal character of the country. "It takes each county separately and thus far it is geographical; but within the boundaries of each county it arranges the land under the names of the tenants in-chief who hold them".[8]

The scheme of classification followed in the *Doomesday Book* is as follows. The population is classified as villani, cotarii, servi, liberi,—homines, sochemanni. The order is rather curious since it describes the various strata haphazardly. We shall follow the scheme suggested by MAITLAND namely to start with the lowest order of men, with the servi and then ascend upwards right to the lord and the Crown.

THE SERFS (SERVI) : The number of serfs recorded in the *Doomesday Book* is about 25,000. We are likely to think that the terms servus and villanns were synonymous in the *Doomsday Book*, as of course they were in the thirteenth century, 'at least among lawyers'. It is not so in the *Doomsday Book*. The term servi is distinctly kept apart from the term villani, bordarii, cotarii in entry after entry. Not seldom are the servi mentioned in altogether different context than the villani.

The *Doomsday Book* tells us very little of the legal position of the servus. But it can be inferred from earlier and later documents that the servus was a slave, with no legal rights. Nevertheless we cannot think of the slave 'as a thing, not a person'. For, as rightly pointed out by

7. MAITLAND F. W.: *"Doomsday Book and Beyond"*. p. 1.
8. Ibid. p. 10.

MAITLAND such a principle is too difficult to be grasped by people of a 'grossly barbarous age'. Thus in this case the idea that the slave is a person is implied.

The degrees of servility are noticed in the *Doomsday Book*. For there-in the existence of a class of buri, burs, coliberti is mentioned which seems distinctly superior to the servi but distinctly inferior to the villiens, bordiers, holders in villienage of a few strip and cottiers in open land. Even the term liberty has been used in some contexts as a matter of degree.

In the eleventh century a definite legal distinction was marked between the servi and other men. There is no confusion as to the meaning between servi and villani. The villani are clearly enough liberi-homines. According to the Norman writers it was possible, under the English law, for the villanus to become a thegn if he acquired five hides (600 acres of land). We get some more information about the position of the serf from *Leges Henrici*. According to the *Leges Henrici* every man is either a liber home (free tenant) or a servus. Free men are either two-hundred-men or twelve-hundred men (that means if they are killed the substantial wergild of 200 or 1200 Saxon shillings must be paid to his kinsfolk). A serf becomes servile either by birth or by sale. Servility is transmitted from father to child. In some cases it passed from mother to child. The freeing of a slave had to be done in public. So also the enslaving of a free man had to be done in public. The villanus who was considered as the lowest of freemen was yet a two-hundred-man.

The servus had no land which he could call in any sense of the term as his own. The villanus had land which he could call his own in some sense of the term. The servus had to stay in his lord's court, he was fed by the lord. This, however, was not a rule all over England. In south-western countries the servi were too many to be menials. It is reported that these servi had arable plots and had oxen. In Essex there was a decrease in the number of servi from 384 to 312. This decrease can be attributed not to change of heart on the part of the landlords but to the change in the nature of rural economy. Henceforth the lord came to depend more and more on the labour of tenants who had plots of their own and less and less on the labour of serfs whom he fed.

THE VILLIENS : Next above the servi comes the class of buri, burs or coliberti. Its strength was about 900, though its members were spread over fourteen shires. In general they are supposed to be more akin to the servi than to the villanus. The term colibertus is a foreign term. Fortunately for us our record explains more than twice that buri and coliberti mean the same thing. The services of a boor vary from place to place. He is usually provided with two oxen, one cow, six sheep and seed for seven acres of his yard-land and household stuff. All this is returned to the lord after his death. This perhaps is the difference between the boor and the townsman or villanus, and brings him near the serf. No doubt the boor gets the full wergild of 200 shillings. In spite of this he may be unfree in a very true sense of the term. For all that he has, belongs to the lord and as such he owes a debt to the lord. Thus he cannot leave his lord. This class is an intermediary between the serf and the villani.

The villani comprised a great number. There were about 1,08,500 villani, about 82,600 bordarii, and some 6,800 cotarii and cosects. For

some important purpose they can be said to form one grand class, though it is found that the three classes were present on some manors. Legally the three classes enumerated above do not have different status. It is only in the economic sense that the three classes are different from each other. It was the difference in the size of tenements which made for distinction. In Wiltshire and Dorset the cosects were considered superior to the cotarii. Even after a lapse of two centuries we find a similar distinction between the tenants of Worcester Priory. Thus there are contamanni whose rents and services are higher, and whose tenements are larger than those of the cotarii.

The *Leges Henrici* considers everyone who is above the rank of a servus, but below that of a thegn, as a villanus. The villanus is thus non-noble liberihomo. Each of them has a wergild of two hundred shillings.

However, in an important sense the villanus is unfree. In the survey of the Eastern counties he is separated from the liberi-homines. A distinction is recognised between a villanus and a free man.

The concept of freedom differed from county to county. Nevertheless, the ministers of William viewed that every manor was held under some lord if not of some lord. This is abundantly clear from the fact that even in the case of land which could be sold, some of the lord's rights remained. The purchaser was to come under the lord's jurisdiction. In some cases the bond between the villien and the lord was of a personal nature. There he could not leave him. However, in the event of such leaving he could not be pursued by his lord. Another distinction is made between those who were free to leave the lord and those who were free to leave the lord with the land.

A distinction was observed between thegns and thegns on the basis of their freedom or otherwise in taking their land. Freedom implied strange things. One of these was power over others. Exceptional privileges, immunities from common burdens were another.

There is no definite information about the exact nature of the services rendered by villiens towards the lords. However, they did some work in connection with ploughing of their lords' demesne. Besides money rents were paid by villiens.

Quite another class of men could emerge, which was above the villanis, due to the system of payment of geld (revenue to the king) by the lord. The lord usually collected it from the thegns and villiens. But even in the case of his failue to do so it had to be paid. The king was thus the best (because he was the wealthiest!) landlord.

Now we come to the condition of the higher strata of the feudal society at the time when the *Doomsday Book* was compiled. The old nobility became effete as a natural consequence of the Norman conquest and new one had taken its place. Unfortunately for us the *Doomsday Book* can give us very little information about this changing of the personnel of the nobility. However, the general acceptance of the theory of dependent tenure, that all land except that held by the king 'in demesne' was of dependent tenure, can give us some clue as to the conditions of the people of higher strata. In fact the acceptance of such a theory seems to be one of the basic assumptions of the *Doomsday Book*.

Every holder, however, big he may have been, held land of some lord. Thus every acre of land, excepting royal demesne, could be said

to be under the managership of some tenant-in-chief. The Norman conquerors could conceive of dependent tenure only. There were gradations made as regards dependency. It was considered that even the greatest estates of lords were held of the king. Subinfeudation was complete. Thus "Brihmaer held land of Azor and Azor of Harold; we may well suppose that Harold held it of the king and that some villiens held part of it of Brihmaer, and thus we see already a feudal ladder with no less than five rungs".[9] The thegns owed 'service' to their lord. The heriot (a certain share of the property) which was taken by the king after the death of his tenant was naturally not grudged. Even a free man could not sell his land without the consent of his lord. Neither could the great lords sell their land without the king's consent.

Military service was associated with the holding of land. Every tenant-in-chief was supposed to render military service. Even the church lands were not free from military service. Petty holders had to group themselves together and supply soldiers to the king.

One important trait of thegn-ship stands out prominently from the record and that is that the 'thegn was a man of war'. Usually the thegns were created by the king as well as by the queen. The thegns were the king's 'servants but also companions'. They had to render him services about the court as well as his person. In war they had to act as his body-guards. Thus the king gave them lands. And the great lords also did the same, trying to ape the king. The thegn no longer lived in the court, but he was a 'warrior endowed with land'. Naturally "the thegnship becomes more than a relationship, it becomes a status".[10] The thegn was a twelve-hundred-man; his wergild was six times as much as that of a ceorl. His status seems to be hereditary because his sons were rated higher than those of a ceorl.

The legal status of all thegns was the same. There were gradations in their rank such as the 'king's thegn highest to him', 'the middle thegn, or 'less thegn'. These gradations were determined by the amount of heriot (share of his property) the king received from the thegn, the greater the amount the higher the thegn.

MAITLAND, taking a bird's-eye-view, describes the feudal state till the end of William's reign as a 'pyramidal' one or one with a 'conical shape'. The society consisted of lords and men. The base was composed of cultivators and tillers of the soil, the apex being the king. The cone was low and the angle was obtuse. At the end of William's reign a peasant had only two lords between him and the king. The angle of the cone grows 'acute under Norman rulers'. (I have largely drawn on MAITLAND's *"Doomsday Book and Beyond"* for the information relating to that period.)

Unfortunately for us no statistics of wages are available for the period considered above. Therefore we cannot correlate economic position and social status. Yet general observation points to the same conclusion. Now we shall proceed to study the information supplied to us by VINOGRADOFF in his masterly study *"Villainage in England"*. VINOGRADOFF agrees with MAITLAND in regarding the existence of the unfree

9. Ibid. p. 155.
10. Ibid. p. 163.

and the free prior to Norman conquest. VINOGRADOFF further opines that the "Conquest cast free and unfree peasantry together into one mould of villainage".[11] He starts where MAITLAND left.

VINOGRADOFF, having recognised the fact of living side by side of the free as well as unfree peasantry, arranges the unfree peasantry into three classes. The basis of classification adopted by him are (1) differences in social standing, (2) differences in economic condition, (3) differences of services.

(1) Here the term villanus is used to indicate servile condition. The term villanus includes both those who are personal slaves as well as the free men who work on servile land.

The term nativus is used in a similar sense. Yet it is used to indicate personal servility specifically unlike the term villanus which includes both the servile and the free.

(2) "The vernacular equivalent for villanus seems to have been viet or veat".[12] The term includes those who were 'regular cultivators of the soil', and those who performed the 'typical services of the manor'. According to the *Rochester Custumal* the niets or the neats were regarded as more free than the cottagers. VINOGRADOFF opines that this degree of superiority ascribed to them indicates only 'superiority in material conditions', and not a superiority in legal position.

(3) Different terms are used to indicate the nature of services. Agricultural work was the expression of the 'economic subjugation' of the peasants by the lord. Those who could pay rents in leiu of such services were distinguished from those who had to render agricultural services in kind. The term operarii is used to denote those who rendered agricultural services in kind.

To my mind this classification seems to be overlapping because the last class can be conveniently included in the second class for the basis is more or less economic.

The power of the lord extended both over the person as well as on the land. The very fact of personal subjection of villain meant the rendering of services and customs to the lord. In other cases the power of the lord extended over land, though not on person. Theoretically power over person did allow even the sale of a villain by a lord. In actuality such practice was quite 'uncommon'. The lord could ask for a merchet from the villain. Merchet was a fine to be paid to a lord by a villain in the event of his daughter's marriage. This of course applied only to those who were servile. In the case of the servile villains the lord had a right on their property.

The Free Peasantry: VINOGRADOFF rightly stresses the fact that even in the case of the so-called free peasantry some kind of dependency clung to them. Even the most free and the most privileged could not get rid of that. The majority of the peasantry was formed by the villains, though there were also free peasants who were 'more or less protected by law', and who were 'more or less independent of the bidding of the lord and his steward'.

11. VINOGRADOFF: *"Villainage In England"*, p. 132
12. Ibid. p. 144.

Tracing the growth of the free peasantry, VINOGRADOFF states that in many cases 'freedom and legal security gradually emerge from subjection'. The introduction of commutation of services in the thirteenth century facilitated the growth of freedom. Because by means of payment of money personal emancipation became possible. This brought about change of a radical nature in the relations subsisting between different constituents of society and the state. The state had no longer to depend on feudal militia but could hire troops. Various intermediary social groups were created between the unfree and the free.

Thus we see how a change in economic conditions can work out a change in social status. VINOGRADOFF has thus scored points over MAITLAND not only by discussing a comparatively later period but by establishing a principle of no mean importance, viz., that improvement in economic conditions facilitates a rise in social status. However, he has not dealt with the problem in a sufficiently detailed manner. VINOGRADOFF does not furnish any statistics of differences of wages. He deals with the problem only in a general way.

For a detailed treatment of the problem we will have to depend on Thorold ROGERS, for his very valuable work on *Agriculture and Prices in England* during six centuries, which was his life work so-to-say for he laboured on it for a period of more than twenty years:

Thorold ROGERS remarks that society was composed of very few elements in the medieval period. The Nobles were naturally ranked the highest. Then came the ecclesiastics, who were composed of gentlemen as well as yeomen. The yeomen had comparatively larger estates than the gentlemen. Then came the 'inhabitants of towns'. Next comes the 'mass of peasant proprietors, who were also labourers either by hire or for tenure'. Last of all came the villanus and the servus.

Rogers does not admit the degraded condition of the villanus and servus. He contends that their servility has been exaggerated. And he adduces evidence in support of his contention. He has based his conclusions on the bailliff's accounts. "I have never found a trace of any transfer of villians, or even of their services, to third parties".[13] We have also seen that, though a serf could legally be sold, in actuality he was never sold. Rogers goes further and enlightens us on an interesting point. A villain who has stayed in a town for a year and a day, without interruption, becomes a free man. No doubt we hear of some cases of prosecution. But the town provided refuge to the unenfranchised.

There were many families in the town. Taxation accounts are found in the Rolls of Parliament, both of these being for the town Colchester and hamlets of Midland, Westdoniland, etc. We get a clue as to the contemporary constitution of population therefrom. "According to the first roll, the clergy were nine, the landowners, apparently possessing what we should call independent means, were seven, tanners were eleven, shoemakers thirteen, general merchants (mercatores) nine, fishmongers six, butchers five, bakers four. Besides these we find the following occupations: aleman, barber, deler, dyer, fancer, farrier, fuel-dealer, parchet-maker, rope-maker, tailor, smith, weaver".[14] Still there remains

13. ROGERS E. T.: *"A History Of Agriculture And Prices In England"*: Vol. I. p. 71.
14. Ibid, p. 103.

a number of persons whose occupation it is difficult to judge by assessment of tax.

By 1300 the number of persons paying tax not only increased, but became more varied.

Discussing the price of labour ROGERS remarks that the inhabitants of town migrated to the villages during autumn season for harvesting work. Besides it is clear from the Statutes of Labourers that this seasonal immigration of labour was from the Northern counties to the Southern counties. The evidence of facts does not permit the view that threshing of grain was performed by the villains as a 'labour-rent'.

Rural pursuits were mainly agricultural. Yet not a few mechanical occupations were present. And quite a large number of population was employed in such occupations. A thatcher was there in every parish or manor. Skill was valued and thus a skilful thatcher was rated as high as a 'first-class' farm-hand. Besides every village had its smith. A smith was employed permanently. "The universal distribution of this surname is indicative of how universal was the presence of this artificer".[15]

Most villages maintained a carpenter to perform ordinary work of repairing farm implements and buildings. But the more skilled carpenter who was concerned in the construction of houses, furniture, etc., seems to have been a migratory workman who shifted from place to place.

Tilers and slators were rare because they could not get business sufficient enough to make them reside in one village. They were perforce migratory workmen. Same was the case with mason. For very few buildings were made of stone, excepting the manor houses.

In many cases the labourer or the artisan was fed by the employer. Naturally in those cases the remuneration was low. The artisans and labourers who were employed permanently were paid higher wages.

However, evidence collected points to the cheapness of labour in the fifteenth century as well as the fourteenth and the thirteenth century since the wages were not so high as they were later. ROGERS attributes this cheapness of labour to the absence of too many middlemen, which is a characteristic feature of industrial society. And I do not see sufficient reason for not accepting this explanation on the part of ROGERS.

ROGERS gives us wages for five districts : (1) the eastern, comprising Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Kent; (2) the Midland, Oxford, Bucks Rutland, Northampton, Cambridge, Hunts, Beds, Middlesex, Herts, Leicestor; (3) The Southern, Hants, Surrey Sussex, Dorset, Wilts, Berks; (4) the Western, Gloucester, Hereford, Somerset, Warwick, Worcestor, Devon, South Wales; (5) the Northern, York, Notts, Cheshire, Cumberland, Durham, Durby, Salop, North Wales.

It can be seen from the table given below that the rate of wages was considerably higher in Eastern England than in other parts of the country. And it was in the Eastern part that there was the main center of thriving woolen industry, namely in Norfolk.

ROGERS is inclined to ascribe the rise in wages by the end of the thirteenth century to the introduction of commutation of labour service by rent payment and the resulting betterment of the peasants condition.

15. Ibid, p. 253.

The Great Plague created a shortage of total labour supply. No wonder that the wages of labour were doubled. In some districts the wages were more than doubled.

The effect of plague was even more marked in the case of wages for reaping. Similar is the case in regard to the wages for mowing. The wages for thatching also increased due to the plague.

Next we come to mechanical labour. Mechanical labour comprised of carpenters, masons, tilers, slaters and, sawyers. It can be seen from the table given on pages 23-24 that the highest rates obtained after the Great Plague. In the case of carpenters of highest kind the rise in wages was less than the rise in the wages of a common, ordinary carpenter. This must have been due to a comparatively smaller demand for higher type of carpentry. In the case of masons, cementarii and latorni the rise in wages was considerable than that in the case of carpenters. The increase is 60 per cent. ROGERS has given wages separately for tiler as well as for tiler and man. In the former case the increase was only 34 per cent where as in the latter case it was 90 per cent. This evidence leads us to the conclusion that lower labour rose higher whereas the higher labour did not record much progress. The slater was to be found only in places where fissile stone was available. Even in the case of a slater the effect of the plague can be evinced from the rise of 60 per cent.

In the case of sawyers also the rise in wages due to plague is considerable, being 70 per cent. And sawying was an inferior kind of labour as compared to other trades. This only goes to strengthen the general conclusion namely that lower labour rose considerably much higher than the higher labour.

The table on page 24 leads us to certain conclusions as regards the socioeconomic position of the various mechanical labourers. It can be clearly discerned that the mason stands slightly lower than the highest kind of carpenter, who stands first. But the mason definitely stands higher than an average carpenter. I am inclined to ascribe this to the connection on the part of highest carpenter and mason with the lords. Because in those days houses were built only by lords. The common people had no use for higher labour. The paradox of relative betterment of the lower labour than the higher labour can be explained by the paucity of demand for work of higher kind. In those days very few were rich enough to require the labour of higher craftsmen.

Then comes the slater. Here also the same reasoning as in the case of highest kind of carpenter and the mason can be fruitfully made use of. Next to the slater comes the tiler. Last of all stands the sawyer.

We find the wages or emoluments given to Surgeons, legal advisors, religious advisors, etc. A surgeon was paid 6 d. for his services in Oxford in 1307. At Oxford in 1308 a legal advisor was paid half a mark. (13s. 4d..). In Oxford an attorney was paid between 6 to 8 pence in 1308. Merton College paid a chaplain at Farley 46s. 2d. per year. The King's chaplain at Langley was paid £ 10 a year. Services at funeral were considered as special services. Merton College paid bishop of Salisbury 13s. 6d. in 1296 for officiating at the funeral of the Countess of Salisbury.

Only few examples are found of payments made for artistic and literary labour. The clerk who wrote accounts for the lord got half a mark per day. And accounts were written only after harvesting. There-

DECENNIAL AVERAGES THRESHING

(The value is given in pence)

Years	East			Midland			South			West			North		
	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Wheat	Barley	Oats
1259-70	2⅞	1¼	¾	2⅛	1	⅝	—	—	—	—	—	—	2½	1¼	⅞
1271-80	2¾	1½	⅞	2⅛	1⅝	1	3⅛	1½	1⅛	2	—	1	2⅜	1½	¾
1281-90	3	1½	1	2⅜	1½	1	2½	1⅜	⅞	2½	—	—	—	—	—
1291-1300	3	1½	1	2⅜	1½	1	2⅝	1⅝	1	2¼	1⅝	1⅛	2	1¼	⅞
1301-10	3	1⅞	1⅛	2¼	1½	1	2½	1½	1	2¼	1½	1	3	2	1
1311-20	3½	1¾	1⅛	3	2	1⅛	2¾	1⅞	1⅛	2½	1½	1	3	1½	1
1321-30	3¼	1¾	1⅛	2¾	1⅜	1	2⅜	1⅜	1	2½	1½	1	2⅞	1⅝	1⅛
1331-40	3	1¾	1⅛	2½	1½	1¼	2⅝	1⅝	1⅛	2⅜	1½	1¼	3	2⅜	1⅜
1341-50	3⅜	1⅞	1¼	2⅞	2	1⅜	3	1⅝	1⅛	2⅜	1⅝	1¼	3	1½	—
1351-60	3¼	2	1⅜	3½	2¾	1½	3½	2	1½	2⅞	2⅛	1½	4	2⅝	1½
1361-70	4¾	3¾	2¼	3½	3	1⅞	3⅝	2	1¾	3	2¼	2	—	—	—
1371-80	5	3	3	2⅞	3	4	3¼	2	3⅛	2¼	1½	4	3⅛	—	2
1381-90	3½	2	1½	3⅛	2½	2	3	2	1⅞	3	2	1½	—	—	—
1391-400	—	—	2⅛	4	2½	2⅜	3	2	1⅞	2¾	1⅞	1½	3	2½	2½
Average upto 1350	3⅛	1⅝	1	2½	1⅜	1	2⅝	1⅝	1	2⅜	1½	1⅛	2¾	1¾	1
1351-1400	4⅛	2¼	2⅛	3½	2¾	2⅛	3½	2¼	1¾	3	2⅛	1⅝	3⅝	2½	2

Source: J.E.T. Rogers—*History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, Vol. I, p.320.

DECENNIAL AVERAGES CARPENTER ETC.

(Values in pence)

Years	Carpenter	Carpenter highest rate	Mason	Tiler	Tiler & man	Slater	Slater & man	Sawyer	Sawing per 100 ft.
1263-70	3½	3½	2½	—	—	2½	—	2½	—
1271-80	2½	2¾	—	—	5¼	2	—	—	—
1281-90	3½	4	4	3	5	—	5¾	3⅛	7½
1291-1300	2⅝	3¾	2¾	3½	5⅛	4½	—	2⅞	7¼
1301-10	3	4⅛	4	3⅛	4	3¼	6⅛	3⅜	—
1311-20	3⅝	4⅞	3¾	6	5⅞	5¾	3¼	10⅛	10⅛
1321-30	3⅜	4⅞	3¾	4	5½	—	6½	3¼	8
1331-40	3¼	4⅝	3⅞	3¾	6⅛	3¾	6⅛	3	8
1341-50	3⅞	4¼	3½	5	5⅞	—	6⅜	2¾	7¾
1351-60	4¼	5¾	4⅞	5	8⅜	5⅜	4⅜	—	8
1361-70	4¼	5½	5⅜	5	—	5½	—	5	—
1371-80	5	6½	6⅛	5½	9½	4⅜	—	5½	—
1381-90	4¾	5½	6	5½	12	5	—	5	—
1391-1400	4⅝	6¼	5⅝	6	11⅜	4½	8	5⅜	16
General average 1263-1350	3⅛	4⅛	3½	4	5⅜	3⅛	6⅛	3	8
1350-1400	4⅝	5⅞	5⅝	5⅜	10¼	5	8	5⅛	12

Source: J.E.T. Rogers—*History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, Vol. I, p. 322.

fore clerks had sesonal work. In Oxford payments were made for writing notes of music in 1308. Similar payments were made at the same place in 1366; and the sum of 29s. was given in 1370 for the labour of writing the third part of NICHOLAS DE LYRA's *Bible*. There is an entry to the effect that the countess of Clare engaged a writer for sixteen weeks for writing a book "Vitae patrum".

In 1275 a painter was hired to decorate the chamber of Roger Bigod, Earl of Norfolk. Colours were supplied to the artist. An image was painted in Maldon church at the cost of 50s. In new college in 1400 £1. s.13 d.4, were paid to get a canopy for the high alter, and for painting an angel on the door of the church.

We have already noted how the Plague led to a considerable increase in wages all over the country. The wages of agricultural labourers as well as mechanical labourers record a steep rise after the Plague. In this phenomenon ROGERS sees the seeds of destruction of the then prevailing social as well as economic order. It has been said by ROGERS that the Great Plague brought about an economic revolution and thereby effected a social revolution. "It is manifest that the lack of labour was the great difficulty of that crises which ensued on the Great Plague, a crisis the event of which was a revolution, at first economical and ultimately social".[16] The husbandmen accumulated money with the help of which they could organise themselves as against the lords. The land-owner was the sufferer on account of increased wages. The farmers and the yeomen prospered for a time. The high prices led to an increase in rents.

However, there was a limit to the betterment of the lot of agricultural labourers. It was not so in the case of industrial labourers. An artisan could become a master. A mechanical labourer could rise to become an engineer. It was possible for a factory worker to own the factory. But it was not possible for agricultural labourer to occupy land, let alone possess it.

III

VINOGRADOFF, by suggesting that commutation of services by payment of rent led to the improvement of their status, set 'the ball rolling'. We are faced with the problem of analysing the forces which led to the disintegration of feudalism.

There is no unity of opinion amongst historians as to the forces which brought about the decline of feudalism. Every author has to say something of his own. We shall do well to collect the grain of truth wherever it can be obtained. We are not concerned with contradiction, which is inherent in various viewpoints.

G. M. TREVELYAN, the author of "*English Social History*" discussing vicissitudes of commutation of services by money payment states that commutation was introduced before the close of the twelfth century. However, by the thirteenth century the process had been reversed. "'Work-days' for which money payments had been substituated in the age of Becket, were being again demanded in the days of Simon de Montford,

16. Ibid, p. 686.

and in some cases new burdens were imposed. A general tightening up and defining of the lords' claim characterized the thirteenth century, particularly on certain great ecclesiastical estates where commutation had formerly been creeping in".[17] He attributes this 'feudal reaction' to the growth of population in the thirteenth century and the land hunger resulting therefrom. Later on the slow-down in the increase of population led again to the readoption of the system of commutation. Just then befell the great calamity, the Black Death (1348-49). This naturally led to the speeding up of the change.

It has been estimated that nearly a third or perhaps half of the population of the kingdom succumbed to the Great Plague. No wonder that the surviving peasantry came to have a better hand over the lord. The common sense 'law of supply and demand' came into operation. The condition of the peasantry improved and commutation proceeded very fast. The servile status was no longer tolerated. Wages rose considerably. All this culminated in the loosening of the hold of the lord over his villiens.

Commutation of services made money available to the lords with the help of which they could employ labourers. The increase in wages was in many cases too high for the lords to afford to pay. Thus they had even to give up the cultivation of their demense by themselves. They had to let it on lease to a new class of yeoman farmer. In pastoral districts peasants came to attain wealth by selling wool.

Thus comes in the new class of yeoman farmer who formed a very suitable intermediary between the lord and villien. "The wide gap between lord and villien that had characterized the society of the feudal manor is being filled up. Indeed the villien serf is in process of extinction."[18] The villien was henceforth either a yeoman farmer or a landless labourer.

The freedom we have described did not come very smoothly. In many instances it had to be won. Hence the rising of 1381. The outcome was the gaining of freedom in general and personal freedom in particular. It was not an unmixed blessing, however. For "many of the serfs won this freedom at the price of divorce from the soil; and the ever increasing wealth of the country was accompanied by greater inequalities of income".[19] Under the feudal system all who were servile were equal. But the emergent village had a wealthy squire, craftsmen and landless labourers. Naturally enough the landless labourers or the socalled proletariat, who had no go in the village, had a tendency to drift towards the towns.

E. LIPSON, an eminent economic historian agrees with G. M. TREVELYAN on the point of the efficacy of commutation of services by payment of money or rent in liberating the serfs. According to LIPSON the essence of the feudal system lay in the close connexion between the lord and the servile tenants. The villiens had to cultivate the lords demesne. Serfdom ensured work by tenants on the lord's soil. The very prosperity of the lord was tied to this compulsory labour. No wonder that commutation of service gave a rude shock to the system. LIPSON includes not only

17. TREVELYAN G.M.—"*English Social History*", p. 8.
18. Ibid, p. 10.
19. Ibid, p. 15.

commutation as factor which led to the disintegration of the manor but also the 'alienation of the demesne'. To me it appears that the second emerges from the first. Alienation of demesne is only the logical corollary of commutation of services. In the case of commutation of services the lord could engage other labourers with the money he received in lieu of services. Where demesne was alienated he had to take recourse to quite another system. The lord had to let his land on lease for cultivation to tenant farmers. "He (lord) gave up completely the system of direct exploitation of the land, and yielded the management of his demesne into other hands; he ceased to be a farmer and developed into a landlord, who leased his estate to tenants and lived on the income accruing from their rents".[20]

LIPSON attaches no small importance to the phenomenon of the Black Death as a factor responsible in the liberation of servile tenants. Discarding the extreme view which regards the Black Death as the main source of all economic changes which led to the disappearance of feudalism, LIPSON states that the Black Death considerably influenced economic conditions by liberating vast amount of labour. "In this respect the Black Death constituted a landmark in the historical evolution of the English peasantry from servitude to freedom".[21] The Black Death accelerated very much the growth of freedom.

LIPSON regards the introduction of money economy or rather the increasing use of money in the years following the Black Death as instrumental in completing the work of liberation. The use of money changed social relations and the very social set-up. "The drift of the movement was, in fact, nothing less than the substitution of a society based upon free contract for a society based upon tenure and status, and the replacement of the customary relations between lord and tenant by a uniform legal bond and cash nexus".[22] This was facilitated by the 'relative increase in the quantity of money' which resulted from decrease in population.

Discussing the causes which led to the disintegration of feudalism, CROOME and HAMMOND have introduced another factor, worthy of note; The authors (of "*The Economy of Britain—a history*") stress the importance of the rise of markets as a factor in the disintegration of feudalism. They argue that the growth of towns as trading centres by opening an outlet to the surplus produce of villages rendered possible the economic betterment of the tenants. Naturally enough the tenants could free themselves from service to the lords. This was facilitated by the increasing use of money, which is an inevitable sequel to the rise of markets. The authors go to the length of suggesting that "one way of looking at the history of the English village during the period 1100-1500 is to regard it as history of the struggle for the right of freely marketing the fruits of the peasant's labour".[23]

The Black Death by leading to an enormous rise in wages made the position of lesser knights and lesser lords economically precarious.

20. E. LIPSON: *"The Economic History of England"*—Vol. I, p. 88.
21. Ibid, p. 102.
22. Ibid, p. 104.
23. CROOME and HAMMOND: *"The Economy of Britain—A History"*, p. 37.

These authors assess the repercussion of the tragedy with caution, however. The authors consider the black death only as a factor 'which complicated the process of economic change; but did not vitally affect it'. Primary importance is not assigned to the Black Death.

MEREDITH, the author of *"Economic History Of England—A Study In Social Development"* comes to the same conclusion as regards the place of Black Death in the dislocation of the feudal system. He writes "it turned the slow decay of the manorial system into rapid dissolution. It threw the economic system of manorial farming, the social system of customary regulation, into like confusion, and made their permanent maintenance impossible".[24] ASHLEY also opines that the Black Death "made the tenants more conscious than before of the value to the lords of their services".[25] CUNNINGHAM maintains that due to the Black Death the position of hired labour improved immensely. Certain social and economic movements started with the Black Death.[26]

Maurice DOBB, a welknown Marxian, analyses the disintegration of the feudal system mainly from the economic point of view. In discussing the correlation between the growth of money economy and commulation of services DOBB opines that there is no such correlationship. He modifies his view by accepting that only in a limited sense can the correlation be said to exist. To the extent that the lord would have some inducement to commute services only if the use of money and consequently market for produce were developed can the thesis be accepted. But it would be wrong to link the two phenomena.

DOBB points out most emphatically that it was the "inefficiency of feudalism as a system of production, coupled with the growing needs of the ruling class for revenue, that was primarily responsible for its decline".[27] This need exerted so much pressure on the system that it broke under its strain.

Disregarding the importance of the Black Death as the factor which led to the decline of agriculture, DOBB opines that the leasing of demesne was an expression of economic crises. Furthermore he asserts that the weakness of Barons in England was one of the main contributory factors in the decline of feudalism. The development of sheep farming induced the Lords to commute services for money rents.

DOBB sounds a note of caution. He dissuades us from believing that such commutation of services meant the abolition of servile status. Even by the sixteenth century serfdom was not completely extinct.

DOBB makes an interesting point. He suggests that it was the growth of towns which facilitated the liberation of servile tenants. It has been already remarked that the feudal economy was subject to excessive pressure. The towns thus provided the necessary relief by absorbing the villiens who had left the land. Moreover ROGERS has stated that a villain who stayed in a town for a year and a day, without interruption,

24. MEREDITH H.O.: *"Economic History of England—A Study in Social Development"*, p. 81.
25. ASHLEY, W.J.: *"The Economic Organisation of England"*, p. 50.
26. CUNNINGHAM, G.: *"Growth of English Industry and Commerce—Early and Middle Ages"*, p. 375.
27. DOBB, M.H.: *"Studies in Development of Capitalism"*, p. 42.

became a free man. DOBB regards the towns 'as more or less free oases in an unfree society'.

DOBB dilates on a very important point as regards the position of the towns. He rightly warns us not to look upon the towns that is the trading communities therein 'as being microcosms of Capitalism'. For in their early stage the towns were not free from the sway of feudal authority. No doubt the urban communities won their freedom. But they had to wage a relentless struggle. This struggle 'sapped the strength of the feudal economy'. The outcome of the struggle was that the trading communities were able to "regulte their trading relations with the country side as to transfer to themselves the profit on this trade, which would otherwise have accrued to the prince or the lord or abbe or the place".[28] And with the increasing freedom of trade and prosperity of the towns the first signs of 'class differentiation within the urban community itself' made their appearance. Hereafter developed trading oligarchies. We shall return to this point a little later.

The statement of various viewpoints regarding the factors which caused the decline of feudalism makes it abundantly clear that the process of the feudal decline was infinitely complex. Various factors were responsible such as the Black Death, rise of markets, growth of towns, change over from exchange economy to money economy, etc. Each of these factors acted and reacted upon each other, adding to the complexity of the situation.

The social and economic results of the decline of feudalism have been of a fundamental nature. The decline of feudalism brought about a change in social relationships. New classes were created. We have already seen how the class of yeoman farmer emerged as a result of the inability on the part of the lords to cultivate their demesne because the wages had risen considerably. LIPSON has clearly pointed out that the increasing use of money introduced the factor of 'cash nexus', which henceforth coloured social relations. BRIGGS the author of "*Economic History Of England*" remarks that the liberation of servile tenants sowed the seed of proletarianism. The manor was like a big family where each member, however unfree, had something to which he could cling. But with the disruption of the manorial system this was no longer the case. Labourers had to move from place to place and thus "they lost this hold on the place of their birth, and they became not men with a definite place in a complex system, but mere units..........in such a sense that they lost all individuality".[29] The old stability of the manor was replaced by mobility. Mobility of labour increased so much that a class of proletarians was created. Henceforth the motive force behind work came to be wages. Since this period starts the career of capital impersonal yet powerful.

IV

Some explanation of the term 'guild system' is necessary before we discuss the growing influence of capitalism. The guild system was

28. Ibid, p. 72.
29. BRIGGS, M.: "*Economic History of England*", p. 79.

not homogeneous. For it started with monopolistic control of trade and manufacturing. Then it became quite democratic, the craftsmen having full control over trade and production. Then again production and trade came to be controlled by wealthy merchants who financed these operations. Thus we perceive the functioning of capitalism side by side with the guilds. If we accept LIPSON's interpretation of the term guild system we shall have to restrict the use of the term only to that period when craftsman was perfectly independent of financial control. Because LIPSON means by the guild system a system of production under which the craftsman had full autonomy. Thus LIPSON specifically mentions "I have used the term 'Guild system' to connote the stage in the evolution of industry where the worker owned both the instruments of production and the raw material, in contrast with the 'Domestic System' where he owned the instruments but not the material, and the Factory System' where he owned neither the instruments nor the material".[30] Of course we do not accept LIPSON's interpretation.

Earlier we have seen that the guilds had been functioning right from feudal times though, of course, the guilds came to wield sufficient power in matters economic as well as social only much later. In feudal times the counterpart of villages could be found in the towns, which were naturally very few in number. With the Norman conquest opportunities of foreign trade between England and Normandy were opened. Naturally enough traders came to constitute an important element of the towns. With the growth of trade came the necessity of protecting it from encroachments. Hence came into being an institution such as the Guild Merchant. This is how Dr. GROSS explains the origin of Merchant Guild in his book *"The Gild Merchant"*. And he has adduced sufficient evidence in support of his argument. He states that "the absence of all mention of the Gild Merchant in the records of the Anglo Saxon period renders it possible that this fraternity first appeared in England soon after the conqueror had established his sway and restored order in the land".[31]

Earliest references to the Guild Merchant are found during 1087-1109 in a charter granted by Robert Fitz HAMON to the burgesses of Burford, and between 1093-1109 in a document made when 'Anselm was Archbishop of Canterbury'. After that the guild merchant is mentioned in municipal charters. The development of the Guild Merchant was fostered by the increasing amount of commerce which was a sequel to the extension of England's possessions on the continent.

It becomes clear from the scrutiny of charters granted in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that the freedom of borough was the most important privilege conferred. The freedom of borough comprised quite a number of things. Judiciary was made independent so that the burgesses were only responsible to the courts of the town. Then there was commutation of tolls and other town dues. They were exempted of paying toll throughout the realm. Markets and fairs could be held. Elections to the town could be held by the burgesses. The boroughs were

30. LIPSON, E.: *"The Economic History of England"*, Preface p. viii.
31. GROSS, C.: *"The Gild Merchant"*, p. 4.

freed from interference by the sheriffs and bailiffs of the lord.[32] We get more information about the implications of such charters. "A natural corollary of this privilege was authority to regulate the conditions under which production should be carried on within the town".[33] The members of Guild Merchant further had a monopoly of trade in the town.

A study of the organization and constitution of Merchant Guilds makes explicitly clear that membership of a guild required payment of fee. Usually the capacity of the payer was taken into consideration in fixing the amount of the fee. The relatives of the member of a guild were given preference. Residence in the same town was not required. Generally a villien was not granted membership of a guild. Villien status was usually a bar to the entrance into guilds.

The guilds were alive to social duties. Helping poor brethren, praying for the dead, contributing for funeral expenses, etc., were taken up by the guilds. In fact there were social and religious guilds functioning. We shall deal with them in detail a little later.

It has been seen as to why guilds came into being, namely for the protection of trade from encroachments of any kind. No wonder then that the essential characteristic of their activities must have been the exclusion of strangers. Relations between the members of guilds were always brotherly and kind. But a non-guildsman was not allowed to trade in the town. Guild had the exclusive monopoly of trading in the borough. "The Guild was the department of town administration whose duty was to maintain and regulate the trade monopoly".[34] This is how Dr. GROSS thought about the function of the guild. He further amends this view by stating that the guilds had in their view the general interest of trade and industry and not only that of a particular town. Nevertheless the restrictions imposed on strangers do not permit us to accept the amendment of Dr. GROSS. Because even where strangers were granted the permission to trade, they were faced with irksome restrictions. One of the worst of such restrictions was the payment of toll to which the stranger were subject. The guildsmen were free from customs, whereas contrary was the case with regard to the non-guildsmen. Again the non-guildsmen were ordained not to trade in retail. They were allowed to buy only during specific hours. Non-guildsman could not enter into partnership with a guildsman so much so that "at Liecester the former was not even allowed to share profits with the latter in return for capital lent."[35]

It is a common maxim that rights imply duties. We should not be oblivious of the fact that the members of the guild had to perform certain duties. The members had to be 'scot and lot' or 'in scot and lot' with the burgesses. To be 'scot and lot' or 'in scot and lot' means that the monetary requirements of the borough had to be provided for by the guildsmen. The capacity to pay was taken into account. Municipalities relied on their assistance in case of emergency.

32. Ibid, p. 6.
33. MEREDITH, H.O.: *"Economic History of England—A Study in Social Development"*, p. 52.
34. GROSS, C.: *"The Guild Merchant"*, p. 43.
35. Ibid, p. 48.

Then again the guildsmen had certain obligations towards member-brothers. They had to share purchases with brethren in case any of the brethren so desired. The debt of any of the members was regarded as a collective liability in case the particular member was not in a position to pay back. The sick and unfortunate brethren were always helped. The unemployed were given a sort of a dole. Competition among the members was always fair. For instance underselling, enticing away others workmen, etc., were prohibited by the law.

We shall next proceed to study the relations between the guilds, the borough-government and the municipalities. Such a study will give us an exact idea as to the place of the guild in the social and political structure. Various theories have been suggested as to the relations between the guilds and the borough government and the municipalities. Some writers like MEREWETHER and STEPHENS state that the guild merchant was purely a mercantile association, without any social functions.[36] This theory is not tenable in the face of facts. There is conclusive evidence to prove that the Guild Merchant was recognised as a civic body in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. Our discussion of the rights and duties of the merchant guild has made it sufficiently clear that it was functioning as a body with certain social duties.

On the other hand there is a theory which is exactly the opposite of the one just considered. According to the exponents of this theory for example Thompson, BRENTANO, etc., the guild merchant was not merely an 'adjuct of a town community' but it pervaded the 'whole area of municipal government', the head of a guild and that of a borough being the same person.[37]

Dr. GROSS characterzes the theory as confusing of whole with a part. In fact the chief merit of Dr. GROSS lies in his lucid distinction between the two, which brings out properly the relation between the two. After studying records at various places, Dr. GROSS points out that the officials of the guild and the borough were definitely distinct. The bailiff of the town and the alderman of the town had separate rolls at Ipswich and Southampton. There is evidence of distinct purses for the guild and the borough at Chester. Then again there were distinct officials for the town and the guild. Thus in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries the local government was not centred in the guilds. On the contrary the guilds formed only a part of the whole system.

We have seen that the main function of the guild was to regulate trade. But in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries trade had not assumed enormous proportions. Hence the sphere of the activity of guild was rather narrow. Naturally the jurisdiction of the guild was limited.

A distinction was observed between the members of the guild and the burgesses. To become a guildsman it was not necessary to be a burgess. So also a person could be a burgesse without belonging to the guild. It was possible to become an inhabitant of a town without being a burgess or a guildsman. For the duties of a guildsman was to pay in scot and lot. The duty of a burgess was to act as a watch and ward, hold office and serve on juries, etc. A burgess was required to be a resident

36. GROSS, C.: *"The Guild Merchant"* p. 61.
37. GROSS, C.: *"The Guild Merchant"*, p. 61.

of the town. Moreover he had to own a burgage, tenement within the town. Such things were not required of a guildsman.

Dr. GROSS, however, points out that the distinction should not be over-emphasized. For there were local variations. In some places there was complete amalgamation between the guild and the borough. He argues that such amalgamation was rendered possible by the special circumstances in the fourteenth century such as the homogeneous nature of population, lesser inequality of wealth and harmony of interests. The professional element was almost absent then. The development of trade facilitated the increase in the influence of the guilds over the borough. LIPSON shares the same views.

The influence of the guilds on the municipal constitution was considerable. Yet it would be wrong to regard the guild as its originator.

We shall study social and religious guilds and then proceed to study the craft guilds, which was a later development of the Guild Merchant.

We have already alluded to the social duties performed by the guilds for instance praying for the dead, helping the funeral, etc. But there were guilds whose special duty consisted of social and religious functions. Rev. J. Malet LAMBERT observes "No attempt to understand or depict the English social life or thought of the period from the 10th to the 16th century can be true to its original in which these (social and religious guilds) institutions do not play a large part".[38] They were not restricted to men, women or any class. Good behaviour was the main condition.

The functions were purely religious. The maintenance and upkeep of the holy churches was looked after. Contributions were raised for helping the poor, who were deserving. The guilds had the power to expel any body for mis-behaviour. The recognition of the good services rendered by these guilds becomes clear from the fact that Henry V granted in 1416 a charter of incorporation to the Great Guild of St. George in Norwich.

Then again the guilds performed various duties. Helping the sick and the poor, the burial of the dead, insuring against theft, education of children, care of the roads, etc., comprised the multifarious activities of the guilds. No wonder that they enjoyed social esteem.

A study of Craft Guilds follows immediately. Since it was only at a later stage of the Guild Merchant that the Craft Guilds came into being. We have seen how the Guild Merchant emerged. With the increasing monopoly of trade and commerce the Guild Merchant came to have considerable sway on the economic life of the people. The borough as well as the municipal administration came to be dominated by the guild merchants. The Guild Merchant was a general term. The term was not restricted to 'large dealers but embraced all who traded'. Craftsmen were freely included in the Guild Merchant from the 12th to the 15th centuries. Dr. GROSS surmises that craftsmen were not only admitted but they formed a majority. Maurice DOBB also admits that craftsmen were freely admitted in the Guild Merchant.[39] Actually the inclusion of craftsmen

38. Rev. J. Malet LAMBERT: *"Two Thousand Years of Guild Life"*, p. 106.
39. Maurice DOBB: *"Studies in the Development of Capitalism"*, p. 84.

in the Merchant Guild led to the formation of Craft Guilds. For as various crafts developed it was no longer possible for the merchant guild to effectively manage the various crafts as well as trade. To my mind it was a case of division of labour. The Merchant Guild had to divide its activities into productive and mercantile. Various crafts had developed so much that they also came to be divided. Thus there were weavers, dyers, skinners, etc.

Dr. BRENTANO has advocated a theory that the Craft Guilds was an outcome of the struggle between artisans and the wealthy merchants who comprised the merchant guild. He contends that artisans were excluded from the merchant guilds. The evidence of facts refutes this theory.

Crafts were admitted first on payment of fees to the burgesses. We have seen how craft guilds were formed as a result of division of labour. This division of labour led to the weakening of the guild merchant. With increasing industrialization the number of guilds of craftsmen increased as a result of specialization of production. Specialization in trading was also attained. In some cases this development led to complete extinction of merchant guilds. The craft guilds attained so much power that they came to control borough and municipalities. We have seen how the Merchant Guildsmen and the burgesses became identical. Similarly craft guildsmen also became identical with the burgesses in their hey day.

The craft guilds were quite democratic in the beginning. There was not much of differentiation between their constituents. They comprised in general of masters, journeymen and apprentices. The system of apprentices gave everybody a fair chance of becoming a master one day. With the growing specialization of crafts the old system no longer functioned. Prohibitive fees were prescribed for apprenticeship in order to restrict admission. Journeymen also were not made masters unless they paid heavy fees. The monopoly of traders became so perfect that craftsmen were systematically excluded. In the beginning very little or practically no capital was needed to set up a craft. But with the specialization of trading as well as production more and more capital was needed. Thus those without capital came to be automatically excluded. A sort of trading oligarchy came to be formed which could successfully control the craftsmen. In fact craftsmen were oppressed. This fact is proved by Government enactments of 1437, 1504 and 1547 which tried to curb the powers of the officials of the guilds.

Amalgamation of various crafts was another source of the complete subordination of workmen. Even master craftsmen were turned into mere wage-earners, with no voice in the control of industry. It is from this time that the separation of the owner producer from the worker producer becomes clear cut. This marks the beginning of capitalist production, whose main characteristic is the divorce between the worker and the owner. Thus the craft guilds were turned into Merchant Guilds as the whole power rested with the merchants and not with the craftsmen.

The guilds had the power to determine the rates of wages. Unfortunately we do not get statistics for the wages paid to the artisans by the Guilds. Thorold ROGERS has given statistics for wages of labour-skilled as well as unskilled.

ROGERS states that copious information about the wages of unskilled farm labourers is available. The wages of an unskilled farm labourer were on a par with those of a mason. More and more labourers were hired for performing agricultural work as feudalism declined. Wages of agricultural labourer did not rise much during 1401-1582.

There is more information available as regards the wages of artisans. It is much more continuous also. This fact signifies the increasing industrialization. There was distinction observed between a carpenter who performed common work and a carpenter who performed special work as of building Colleges, Churches, etc. Thus the latter was paid higher wages. Skill was thus valued.

In every craft there was a master to superintend over the work performed by artisans. He was generally 'master carpenter or free mason'. These master craftsmen did the work of drawing plans for buildings. In the middle ages architects were employed. In some cases they were employed regularly. There is a reference to such an engagement of an architect for a new Building as the Abbot of Edmundsbury in 1435. He was paid £ 10 for himself and his man. The share of the master was supposed to be £ 6 5 s. whereas the servant was to receive £ 3 5 s.

A carver of ceiling at Magdalen College in 1517 was paid only 8 d. a day, though possessed of skill. Clerks were paid as much as ordinary artisans.

Bricks came to be used for building houses by the end of the fifteenth century. The author complains about the paucity of entries as to the bricklayers. But he conjectures that the emolument of bricklayers must have been pretty high.

Various other crafts were introduced. Thus there is reference to the glaziers. Between 1418 and 1532 the glaziers were paid on an average 6½ d. per day. Then work of plastering is mentioned. Palsterers were paid nearly 6 d. between 1401 and 1532. In the latter years they got on an average nearly 11 d. Painters were paid 6 d. Daubers were employed, who were paid 6½ d. between 1417 and 1534, and 8 d. afterwards. The wheel-right got 4 d. in 1405, 6 d. in 1437 and 1 s. in 1581. A lathmaker received 5¾ between 1421 and 1505 10 d. in 1582. The goldsmith was paid 6 d. in 1519. All this goes to prove a change in the nature of economy. A trend towards rapid industrialization can be marked.

The king could command the services of any artisan, irrespective of any contract entered into with a private person by that artisan.

Various artisans were superintended by masters who were also called wardens. Naturally enough they were paid higher than the craftsmen.

ROGERS after stating that the wages of domestic servants did not rise at all, mentions that officers in the navy were very well paid, absolutely as well as relatively. A captain in the navy was paid £ 91 5s. for the year. A leiutenant was given £ 36 10s. Captain of a smaller vessel was paid £ 24 7s. Ordinary gunners were paid £ 9 2s. 6d. Thus protective forces were highly paid.[40]

It has been remarked that there was an absence of professionals

40. ROGERS, E.T.: *"A History of Agriculture and Prices in England", Vol. IV*, **Ch. XVII, 'On The Price of Labour'.**

as a class. Messrs CARR-SAUNDERS and WILSON, however, see germs of professions in the vocations practised then such as law, surgery, etc. The very organisation of craft guilds testifies to the germs of professionalism. In the earlier middle ages every activity was controlled by the Church. And it was quite natural that religion dominated the whole life. Vocations such as law, medicine, education, etc., were completely controlled by the Church. In fact for taking up any vocation it was essential to take ecclesiastical order. "But it was not merely that entry to the professions was by way of the Church; maintenance and promotion within the professions was also by way of ecclesiastical preferment".[41]

This was true of earlier middle ages. Later on this was not the case. By the end of the thirteenth century it was no longer necessary to be an ecclesiatic to take up the vocation of law. The same about the surgeons whose organization became secularized by the fourteenth century. These organizations were more or less like the craft guilds because they emulated the craft guilds as far as the regulation of craft was concerned. These organizations had shaken off the bond of the Church. Only Civil Servants, psysicians and teachers remained under the sway of the Church.

No wonder that even those professions which were controlled by the Church became secularized as the influence of the Church dwindled. The authors opine that by the end of the sixteenth century the process of secularization was completed. The increasing trade and commerce gave more and more opportunities to the people to take up independent professions. "The break up of the medieval corporations and the passing of wealth into private hands meant among other things that he (any person) could earn an income otherwise than through the holding of the ecclesistical benefice".[42] Even civil servants came to be recruited from laymen.

Though the organizations resembled the craft guilds, they did not suffer the same fate which the guilds did after expansion of trade and accumulation of capital because these organizations rendered personal service and as such needed no capital.

A review of the remuneration paid to various craftsmen, skilled as well as unskilled makes it clear that society then recognized skill or ability. For instance a clear distinction was made between a common carpenter and a carpenter who performed work of a special kind. Not only that skill was recognised but it was better remunerated. Ordinary artisans and agricultural labourers, who possessed no special skill received the same wages. Skilled mechanical labourers that is master craftsmen were paid higher.

The development of trade and industry and accumulation of capital changed old valuations. No longer was skill by itself valued highly. For it was no longer enough to have skill. Possession of capital became necessary. In the early days of the craft-guilds skill was valued highly, both socially as well as economically. Later on the growing use of capital rendered skill of secondary importance. Skill was hired. Naturally it lost its former prestige.

41. CARR—SAUNDERS, A.M., and WILSON, P.A.: *"The Professions"*, p. 290.
42. Ibid, p. 292.

To me it appears that social and economic revolutions ran parallel in England. For right from feudalism wealth and power, which comes through wealth have determined social position. The lords who formed the most wealthy portion of the population wielded immense power and were ranked socially highest. With the gradual dwindling of their financial resources their power became less and less. The growth of trade and commerce and the development of towns gave feudalism a final blow. The lords lost the monopoly they had.

There can be no doubt that the society under the guild system was much more mobile than what it was under the feudal system, the status system. Nonetheless the guild-system had also quite an element of the status system in-as-much-as it came into being to protect exclusive trading rights. A resemblance can be marked between the unfree tenure under feudalism and the arbitrary exclusion of non-guildsmen from trading rights under the guild-system. Thus it would not be wrong to say that the guild system is but a counterpart of feudalism in the towns. For it came into being in order to possess exclusive trading rights. The guilds exploited their monopoly to amass wealth by not allowing others to trade. Gradually the guilds declined because they became unwieldy. Specialization of production as well as trading led to the extinction of merchant guilds. Craft Guilds were formed, which in the beginning were very democratic. But later on accumulation of capital in private hands made these craft guilds controlled by the rich. No longer did the craftsmen have any voice in the trade or industry. Skill was degraded to the status of hired labour. Possession of capital alone meant prosperity and thus higher social standing. The aldermen, the sheriff of the borough and municipalities were selected from amongst the wealthy owners and not from master craftsmen. Labour came to be divorced from ownership. And all power came to be rested in the hands of the owners.

We have seen that the merchant class came to wield immense power as a consequence of their wealth. The class won trading privileges and monopolies by lending out money to knights, nobles as well as the king to start with. Then again usury fattened the capital. DOBB points out a very interesting feature of this class. And that was the readiness on the part of these merchants to compromise with the declining nobility, once they had won the power. They bought land, took to the ways of life of the nobility. Marital relations were entered into. And the old nobility gladly accepted them as it was economically beneficial to do so. However, socially they were rated lower than the nobility. But by DEFOE's time they became callous. This becomes clear from DEFOE's story in which a merchant retorted, when a squire tried to look down upon him by refusing to call him a gentleman, that he could buy a gentleman. Eventually the new aristocracy replaced the old one.[43]

It has almost become proverbial that in dealing with social phenomena no clear cut division can be made. Social process is an evolution. And hence we get mixed systems. There is an intermingling of features of different systems. One system shades into another. Thus the guild system had in it certain elements of the domestic system.

43. Maurice DOBB: *"Studies in the Development of Capitalism"*, pp. 120-22.

V

It has already been seen how capitalism had infiltrated into the system of production and trade as early as the fifteenth century. Capitalism stole its way first. By and by it came to be firmly rooted in the social system. It's control became greater and greater. The domestic system marks the beginning of the control of the capitalist. The craftsman was supplied with raw material by the capitalist who would extract profit by selling it in the market.

The great landlords were there, but quite few in number. The yeomen were a powerful class. The yeomen could survive the disastrous effects of price changes in the Tudor period. Later with the dissolution of monasteries the yeoman and squire could purchase more land. Thus they became wealthy. The feudal nobles had disappeared long back. The gentry who stood next to the nobles profited by the sale of monastic land which Henry VIII executed for his own purpose.

The monastic lands were cultivated by tenants and farmers. On the dissolution of monastic land they became tenants and farmers of the new purchasers, the gentry. The servants of the farm also got employment with the gentry. However, they no longer reaped one advantage which they could from their old masters, the monks, namely that of free education. Henry VIII dissolved also the schools set up by the monks.

The enclosure of land during the Tudor period meant on the one hand concentration of wealth and on the other the impoverishment of the masses. TREVELYAN opines that enclosure did not lead to rural depopulation to the extent it is often thought to have done.[44] He further opines that the effects of the dissolution of monasteries have also been exaggerated. Actually the debasement of coin by Henry was the main cause of the trouble. For it upset various classes, especially the poorer ones. Thorold ROGERS also holds the same view.[45] Those who had to pay rents were at a loss. Those with fixed rents did not suffer. The yeomen did not have to pay any rents. Besides, they could get more than three times what they got formerly for their produce. Hence they stood to gain. The nobles suffered due to the price rise as they were absentee landlords. They did not take quick steps to terminate old leases.

The gentry henceforth dominated the scene. The gentry was not only industrious but very practical. He added to his income from the land whatever his sons got from trading. The sons of the gentry were apprenticed to trade and industry. Herefrom we can mark the growing preponderance of trade and industry over agriculture. TREVELYAN remarks that "owing to the habit among the gentry of apprenticing their younger sons to trade, our country avoided the sharp division between a rigid caste of nobles and an unprivileged bourgeoisie, which brought the French ancien regime to its catastrophe in 1789".[46]

As a result of Henry VIII 'rapacious' litigations lawyers came into prominence. By being servants of the govt. they could reap a rich har-

44. TREVELYAN, G.M.: *"English Social History"*, pp. 117-23.
45. ROGERS, Thorold: *"A History of Agriculture and Prices in England"*, Vol. IV, p. 112.
46. TREVELYAN, G.M.: *"English Social History"*, p. 126.

vest. Their class was a new creation. And as such they had much in common with the yeomen and the merchant. All of them had given up feudal ideals. Moreover, they took to protestantism. Thus a new class evolved, the middle class. The protestant ethics permitted married life as well as business.[47] "Puritanism was the schoolmaster of the English middle classes. It heigtened their virtues, sanctified, without eradicating, their convenient vices".[48]

Production of cloth was done under the domestic system. Raw material was provided by the owner to the weavers. The domestic system of production meant control of the capitalist. The craftsmen became mere employees. Maurice DOBB sees in this subordination of labour to capital germs of the factory system. He remarks "the subordination of production to capital, and the appearance of this class relationship between capitalist and the producer is, therefore to be regarded as the crucial watershed between the old mode of production and the new, even if the technical changes that we associate with the industrial revolution were needed both to complete the transition and to afford full scope for the full maturing of the capitalist mode of production and of the great increase in the productive power of human labour associated with it".[49] As long as ownership of land had not been concentrated in the hands of a few, the domestic system could work well. Ownership of small property in land gave additional source of income to the craftsmen. It was only with the doing away of small ownership of land that production came to be more and more subordinated to capital. We have seen how the enclosures started the dissolution of small peasant proprietors. Thus the land and industry was linked together. DOBB is perfectly justified in stating that it was the concentration of landed property which sounded the death knell of the domestic industry. Moreover the economic condition of craftsmen was so poor that they had to incur debts, as a result of which their instruments of production came to be in the hands of their creditor, the wealthy capitalist.

During Elizabeth's reign the yeomen, the gentry, the merchants and lawyers dominated social life. Earlier it has been seen how the decline of nobles increased the power of the yeomen. The medieval character of the village had disappeared. Serfdom was extinct, yet there was compulsory labour. By the statute of apprentices (1563) it was made incumbent on every man between twelve and sixty to serve in husbandry if he had no independent means or was not already fruitfully employed. Transition from medieval to modern village had not been completed.

English rural society was composed of three classes : landlords, yeomanry and labourers. Landlords received a heavy blow by the dissolution of the manor. Henceforth they had to depend on personal initiative. Only those who took special pains could thrive. The rest of them perished. We have seen how the debasement of coinage led to the extinction of absentee landlords. Most of their lands were taken up the yeomanry, which rose to importance during Elizabeth's reign. The yeo-

47. Max WEBER: *"The Protestant Ethic and Rise of Capitalism"*.
48. TAWNEY, R.H. *"Religion and the Rise of Capitalism"*, p. 211.
49. Maurice DOBB: *"Studies in the Development of Capitalism"*, p. 143.

man has been eulogized as constituting the backbone of the nation. GRETTON regards yeomanry as middle class. Thus he explains that "the shattering of the old landed system revealed the presence of a section of the community capable of taking its place, and providing a link between the Crown and the masses of the people".[50] The yeoman had gained sufficient power and wealth. The ranks of the landed gentry were filled by yeomen, squires, merchants and lawyers who had earlier made their fortunes. Then again the Peers of the realm were picked up from the wealthy gentry. The Peers substituted the nobles in a way, though not completely.

TREVELYAN rightly regards the Elizabethan age as 'a great age' for the gentry. For they increased in number as well as in wealth. The wise practice on the part of squires and gentry to apprentice their sons in trade and industry maintained a link between the two. Thus landed intersts came to be linked with trading interests. This intermingling of landed and commercial career was not looked down upon. TREVELYAN points out an interesting feature of social valuations then obtaining. The status of a 'gentleman' was not confined to the landed proprietors. Any one who paid taxes as the yeoman and the squire did, and tipped liberally could be regarded as a gentleman. TAWNEY rightly observes that riches. no matter if it was not ancient, carried gentility.[51]

Classes were accepted by the people without any 'fuss'. The Peers were reckoned as the top most. Then came the landed gentry, the yeomanry, the lawyers, the merchants. Last of all were the labourers. There was an amount of flexibility in the class divisions in the sense that there was considerable mobility. Any one could go up from one class to another, not only by gaining wealth, but simply by changing his occupation. Class divisions were not hereditary.

Last of all in the rural hierarchy stood the agricultural labourers. A distinction was made between them on the basis of period of employment. Some of them were employed for a year. Others were hired by a day. Wages were lower in the middle of the sixteenth century as compared to the wages in the seventeenth century. Thorold ROGERS regards the statute of Apprentices as degrading the labourer. Even in Canterbury, which had a reputation for paying good wages, wages of any artisan did not exceed 1 s. a day. At Oxford wages paid to a free mason were only 2s. 2d. in 1589.

Merchants as a class gained importance as a result of an extension of trade and commerce. The fact is revealed in the statues of merchants being erected in the towns. New and more markets were found by the merchants. The Queen positively encouraged this. Fighting on the open seas was undertaken with a view to amass wealth by loot, plunder and trade and not for occupying foreign countries. The influence of wealth was recognized. GRETTON is inclined to attribute high motives to the merchant adventurers. He remarks that they introduced a new ideal of national progress. We cannot accept this for the individual glory of the merchants and the glory of the nation was a mere coincidence. The power of money having been recognized, the interests of the merchants and the state came to be the same. Only in one sense

50. R. H. GRETTON: *"The English Middle Class"*, p. 114.
51. TREVELYAN: *"English Social History"* pp. 164-65.

can the merchants be said to have introduced the ideal of national progress. And that was by shifting the importance from cities to the country as a whole. This was facilitated by the increasing use of money. In olden times the right of trading was restricted to guilds. But the dissolution of guilds made trade free. Instead of the control of the guild came the control of the individual organizer. Moreover the availability of credit led to the expansion of trade without let or hindrance. Formerly capital was not available.

During Elizabeth's reign navy was increased for commercial gains. Navy was necessary to guard commercial interests. It is thus that greatness was thrust on the merchant adventurers. And thus accumulation of capital was given additional impetus. Elizabeth appointed Justices of the Peace, whose duties were of a varied character. Not only that wages and prices were controlled but even apprenticing was regulated. National control was exercized with vigour over all the activities.

In the Stuart period the lawyer, the doctor, and such other professionals prospered. Gentility could be acquired by possessing wealth. More and more opportunities for acquiring more money were available. The dissolution of nobility and landed classes opened new vista. The professions had a limited income under the old order. For the lawyers, doctors, etc., served the nobility and the landed classes. And their source of income was limited. So also a clerk who kept accounts for the lord had a very limited income. The development of trade and the growing wealth of traders and merchants afforded better chance to the professionals.

With the dissolution of the old order the professionals had no longer to depend on employers. They became independent. Gretton who characterizes the middle class as "that portion of the community to which money is the primary condition and the primary instrument of life"[52] opines that it was only after the increasing use of money as an instrument of social enhancement that professionals came to be ranked with the middle class.

Trading companies which had been established in Elizabeth's reign grew richer during the Stuart rule. Accordingly the importance of London as trading centre increased. Colonization proceeded fast as peace was there. As a result of colonization new openings were found for the tenants, craftsmen, sons of yeomen who could get no land at home. The East India Company enhanced the wealth of the nation.

The small yeoman and small trader were in distress. They had not enough money to buy shares of the new companies which were making enormous profits. The yeomen took sides in the Civil War without any self interest. The Civil War did not involve any economic issues. It was mainly a war accentuated by religious motives. So also it did not have economic repercussions. For though lands of the Crown and Church passed into the hands of the Cromwellians, all these lands were restored to the King and the Church on restoration. Hence new aristocracy was not created.[53] The nobility suffered even more after the Civil War. Because they did not join the 'round-heads'.

52. GRETTON: *"The English Middle Class"*, p. 8.
53. G. M. TREVELYAN: *"English Social History"*, p. 243.

Structurally, the society under the Stuarts was almost the same as it was during Elizabeth's reign. There was a demand for land on the part of those who had made money in trade. Industrial production was carried on under the domestic system. No improvements in land could be effected as the yeomen lacked the money required for undertaking such improvements.

But the power of capital was recording considerable progress. The crafts which had been freed from control of the older mercantile corporations were controlled by capitalist craftsmen. Henceforth they became the 'merchant employers'. The yeomanry which played an important part in the Government was not elected by the rank and file but it was nominated by the richer craftsmen who also formed part of the government.

DOBB observes that in addition to the domestic system, there were also some examples of factories where labourers were employed at regular wages. However, such examples were few. DOBB maintains that the amount of capital locked up in the instruments of production had assumed enormous proportions. Whereas in Elizabethan times £100 or £200 was sufficient as capital, by 1638 collieries must have locked up considerable capital as they are reported to have been producing to the tune of £450 per year.[54] Thus the domestic system was tending more and more towards complete subordination of production by capital.

In 1610 a mower was paid 10d. a day, a haymaker and reaper 8d. A master carpenter was getting 1s. 2d. a day. In 1595 an artisan got 9d. a day, on average and a peasant 6d. a day on average. In 1632 when the price of wheat was high the wages of a day labourer were 8d., a tasker got 8d. a day. Reaper got 1s. a day. Chief carpenters got 1s. so also did free masons. Slaters and tilers got 1s. 2d. The rise in prices of food was so much that the labourers did not find the wages sufficient to cover bare necessaries of life. In summer the wages were higher than those in winter. The wages did not keep pace with rising prices. Hence the labourers suffered.

High skill was valued. Thus in 1610 the architect who was engaged in building a college was paid £ 1 a week. Ordinary artisans and labourers employed in the same work were paid only between 5s. to 8s. a week.

The period from 1643-52 was a period of rise in wages. So also was the period between 1663-1672. Thorold ROGERS attributes this rise to the ravages of plague. But the rise in prices was much more. No wonder that pauperism increased in the seventeenth century. Gregory KING considered labourers as burdens to the nation for they had to depend on poor rates, their wages being insufficient to feed their families. All this was due to the increasing control of merchant manufacturer and divorce of workers from land.[55]

As mentioned earlier skill was valued. Thus a higher paver was paid 3s. ¾d. a yard whereas an ordinary paver was paid only 3½d. a yard. Similarly a painter who had to do some nice work was paid 2s. 2d. a day in 1658.

54. DOBB: *"Studies in the Development of Capitalism"*, pp. 137-39.
55. ROGERS, E.T.: *"Agriculture and Prices in England"*, Vol. V. Ch. XXIII.

In early times the only avenue which could lead to social advancement was the church. But the growing power of money opened considerable avenues of advancement to people. And when the rich merchants came to dominate politics the older statification vanished. Anybody could avail of the ever widening field of opportunities for betterment as a result of the prosperous trading companies. Ambition had no limit. Anybody who was in possession of stocks of rich trading companies could go to any level. GRETTON remarks that this ever increasing ambition led to the development of economic individualism among the middle class, which played an important role in the nineteenth century.[56]

After the restoration a change came over in the attitude of people towards religion. They no longer attached undue importance to religion as they did formerly. The civil war as we have already noted, was fought on religious and political basis. Charles II persecuted the Puritans. Amongst those who suffered were wealthy merchants and industrious artisans. They had to change their attitude. The landed gentry cleverly adopted a change in their attitude and was thus saved from persecutions. The roundheads changed into Whigs, who refused to allow the tampering of religion in wordly gains. A common religion evolved that of Anglicanism.

This evolution bound the upper class and the gentlemen. But politically they were divided into the Whigs and the Tories. The Tories represented the old landed estates. The Whigs, though comprised of landed gentry, favoured alliance with commercial elements. Naturally the Whigs stood to gain because they knew the way the wind was blowing. The Tories failed to realize the same.

The landowners availed themselves of the educational opportunities and moved with the times. But small squires, who were not educated, could not pull on. The economic conditions were unfavourable to them. The increasing use of capital rendered them unable to compete effectively. Gradually the small squire was eliminated. Those who had amassed wealth by trade were eager to buy lands. So also the great landowners were eager to extend their landed property. The Whigs were the big lords. The Tories were usually small squires.

This tendency of concentration of land is nothing but a counterpart of the concentration of industry. The big industrialists were buying the small ones. So did the big landlords. Once again we see the close link between land and industry. In fact this link became closer and closer year by year.

Political power also came to be concentrated in the hands of big landowners. However, interests of trade and industry were not neglected. For the interest of the two were no longer opposing but one. The betterment of one was conducive to the betterment of the other. Hence no conflict ensued.

Gregory KING who is considered as the father of the science of statistics made an estimation of the number of people belonging to various classes of the population then from hearth taxes. TREVELYAN rightly regards this as no more than 'shrewd guess' (Refer Table on page 44). In addition to the table, the following facts may be noted for further

56. GRETTON, R.H.: *"The English Middle Class"*, pp. 151-55.

Number of families	Ranks, Degrees, Titles and qualifications	Heads per family	Number of persons	Yearly income per family
				£
160	Temporal Lords	40	6400	3200
26	Spiritual Lords	20	520	1300
800	Barons	16	12800	800
600	Knights	..13	7800	650
3000	Esquires	10	30000	450
12000	Gentlemen	8	96000	280
5000	Persons in greater offices and places	8	40000	240
5000	Persons in lesser offices and places	6	30000	120
2000	Eminent Traders and merchants by sea	8	16000	400
8000	Lesser merchants and Traders by sea	6	48000	198
1000	Persons in the Law	7	70000	154
2000	Eminent Clergymen	6	12000	72
8000	Lesser clergymen	5	40000	50
40000	Freeholders of the better	7	28000	91
120000	Freeholders of the lesser sort.	5½	660000	55
150000	Farmers	5	750000	42/10/-
15000	In Liberal Arts and Sciences	5	75000	60
50000	Shopkeepers and Tradesmen	4½	225000	45
60000	Artisans and Handicrafts	4	240000	38
5000	Naval Officers	4	20000	80
4000	Military Officers	4	16000	60
50000	Common seamen	3	150000	20
364000	Labouring people and out servants	3½	1275000	15
400000	Cottagers and Paupers	3¼	1300000	6/10/-
35000	Common soldiers	2	70000	14
	Vagrants, Gypsies, theives, beggars etc.		30000	
			5500520	

Source: Gregory KING'S Tables 1688 as quoted by G. M. TREVELYAN, *English Social History*, p. 277.

elucidation of income gradation with reference to social position. "According to G. KING's historical document, in England, in the seventeenth century, the gradation of annual income began with £5—the income of the ill-paid pursuits; further on gradually rose to £15, for the agricultural labourers and country folks; to £38, for the artisans and craftsmen; to £42, 10s. for the farmers; to £45, for the shopkeepers and tradesmen; to £60, for those engaged in the arts and science; to £60-80, for the naval and military officers; to £55 to £90, for the freeholders; to £50 for the inferior clergy; to £72, for the dignified clergy; to £154, for the lawyers; to £200 to £400, for the merchants; to £280, for the country gentleman; to £450, for an esquire; to £650, for a knight; to £880, for a baronet; and finally at the top of a cone we have the king and the richest men with incomes much greater still".[57]

One thing stands out in prominence from this table and that is the smallness of the number of yeomen and squires. The number of rural proletariat was quite large. For the labouring class which has been styled as the wage—earning class were not completely dependent on wages. Some of them had a go in the Commons and gardens. Besides the use of the term family by Mr. KING is misleading. In those days even servants were included in the families of lords.[58] ROGERS points out that domestic service provided employment to those who had no other employment. KING must have meant to include home servants in the families of the lords and others highly placed. Lord SPENCER had 31 male and 9 female servants at Wormleighton. One of the male servants was paid £10 a year, another 66s. a year, a third 53s. 4d. a year and still another 26s. 8d. The rest of them were paid 40s. each.[59]

According to KING one fifth of the population depended on alms for living. The explanation for this fact has already been noted.

It becomes quite clear from the table that classes were determined by the amount of wealth. Social rank and economic conditions went hand in hand. It is from this time that we can clearly mark a correlation between wealth and rank. The impact of capitalism had brought about a change in social valuations.

In Elizabethan time there were certain restrictions imposed on trade and commerce in the shape of monopolies. The Queen granted charter to certain companies only. The effect of Puritan movement was to foster the idea of liberty. People resented restrictions on liberty. As a logical consequence of this, restriction on economic liberty was also resented. Naturally there was a movement towards *Laissez Faire*, culmination of which is to be found in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Moreover the development of overseas Colonies, establishment of banking facilities facilitated the growth of economic freedom. One had no longer to depend on his own capital or combine with others. Individualism gained force.

During Queen Anne's reign a steady progress towards the Industrial Revolution was made. The old craftsman and peasant were not only there but were enjoying prosperity due to increased demand for

57. SOROKIN: *"Social Mobility"*, pp. 53-54.
58. TREVELYAN:..*"English Social History"*, pp. 276-278.
59. ROGERS, E.T.: *"Agriculture and Prices in England"*, Vol. V. p. 659.

their products as a result of the growing commerce. As yet the conflict between town and country had not made it's appearance. Nevertheless concentration of landownership was going apace. For merchants and traders who had made money 'poured' it into the lands.

The landowners, knowing the potential advantages of improvement in land, sought to consolidate estates. Enclosures of commons to a scale never reached before was the inevitable outcome.

However, the yeoman as well as tenant farmer reaped a rich harvest. They had benefited by the improvements in land. A yeoman was better off than a tenant farmer in political respects. For he had a vote for the Parlimaent, whereas a farmer tenant did not have. There was practically no difference in the economic conditions of the two.

There were various gradations of the country gentleman according to 'wealth and culture'. The Dukes naturally were at the top. Then came the squire, the yeoman. The increasing land hunger ultimately ousted the squire. It was a competition between the strong and the weak. And as usual the weak succumbed. In spite of various avenues for investment being available money was spent in lands, not as an investment but as a means to social prestige.

The landed gentry prospered because their sons were usually apprenticed in trade and industry, they had two strings to their bow. This explains the Whig ascendancy. Moreover snobbery had not entered as regards the education of their children. It was not obligatory to send their sons to 'exclusively' patrician schools', which involved great expenses.[60]

DEFOE had divided population into seven classes in 1709.

(1) The great who live profusely.
(2) The rich who live very plentifully.
(3) The middle sort who live well.
(4) The working traders who labour hard but feel no want.
(5) The country people, farmers, etc., who fare indifferently.
(6) The poor, that fare hard.
(7) The miserable that really pinch and suffer want.

Obviously enough this classification is with reference to economic condition. But social rank is also included, though indirectly.

It was a common feature in those days that high wages and insubordination prevailed in town whereas exactly the opposite was the case in the country. The normal agricultural wage was eight pence or ten pence or at the most 1s. a day. The importance of London was an established fact. Commercially, industrially and even socially it was regarded as the most advanced city. However, London had its own evils. As trenchantly pointed out by TREVELYAN, London was also a most filthy place as far as unskilled labourers were concerned. Unskilled labourer never was given education.[61]

GRETTON characterizes the eighteenth century as the period in which the middle class predominated. And rightly so, for the old aristocracy had perished and the new one was recruited from the wealthy merchants principally. They owned vast lands but only as a means to social prestige. Otherwise their wealth was a result of trade and com-

60. TREVELYAN, G.M.: *"English Social History"*, p. 307-309.
61. Ibid, p. 331.

merce. They were at the helm of affairs, commercial, political and administrative. The lower class of artisans was subordinated. Small land holders were craving for being admitted into the higher circle. But to no avail. It was restricted to the most wealthy landowners.

The professionals, the lawyers, the doctors, civil servants, accountants, etc., profited by increasing use of money as commerce developed. But they could not reach the top limit. They were more or less as servants of a higher type, but with limited income. There was on the other hand no limit tó the amount of wealth earned by merchants and manufacturers.[62]

There was a gradual transition from the domestic system to the factory system which is the keynote of Industrial Revolution. It was the development of industries which made more and more wealth available. The parliamentary struggle for promotion of industry was quite natural. Industries gave rise to new employments such as shipping and seamen. Besides whatever was required from external countries could be available by sending out products of industry. General employment having increased, there was more and more demand for food. Naturally agricultural employment increased.

The dependence of industries on trade made for the increasing domination by the capitalist. In the clothing trade the domestic and the capitalist system functioned side by side. But the increasing external commerce made for the sway of the capitalist system, as under capitalist system supervision of work could be made more effectively. So also a capitalist was in a better position to know the size of the foreign market and direct production accordingly. In spite of all this the domestic system could hold its own, until the introduction of expensive machinery made it impossible.[63].

Introduction of machinery was gradual. As inventions were made, more and more machinery came to be used. The whole period is one of transition from the domestic to the factory system. The increasing power of capital had serious social and economic repercussions which have already been alluded to. There was a transition in social valuations also.

The study made so far reveals the close link between social rank and wealth. We may not accept LORIA's thesis that all social organization is a result of economic forces. Yet we will have to accept his theory of connective institutions wherein he maintains that morality, law and politics are mainly influenced by economic factors.[64] We have seen how social ideals changed with the increasing use of money. Similarly we have noted how parliamentary power came to be controlled by the wealthy mercantile element.

We shall see the increasing interconnexion between economic factors and the connective institutions as we proceed to the study of a fully developed capitalist system. Hence we proceed to study the conditions obtaining since the Industrial Revolution, since when the capitalist power gained more or less complete control over the national affairs.

62. GRETTON, *R.H.*: *"The English Middle Class"*. Ch. viii.
63 CUNNINGHAM, *G.*: *"Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times"*, p. 494-499.
64. LORIA, A.: *"Economic Foundations of Society"*, p. 114.

CHAPTER II

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND AFTER

(A.D. 1760 to A.D. 1880)

Plan Of The Chapter :

(I) Industrial Revolution and its repercussions on the relationship between social status and economic position.

(II) Revolution in Agriculture and the impact of the same on the social structure with special reference to economic conditions.

(III) The interconnexion between the two revolutions and their impact on society. ......

(IV) From *Laissez Faire* to State interference. Beginnings of Imperialism.

I

It will be pertinent to discuss the propriety or otherwise of the favourite expression "Industrial Revolution". For thereby it will be possible to judge the exact implications of the expression. The pocket Oxford dictionary lays down the meaning of the word 'Industrial' as pertaining to industries or of industries. It describe industrialism as a system wherein there is a prevalence of industries. The same dictionary gives the meaning of the word 'revolution' as fundamental change. Thus the meaning of the expression "Industrial Revolution" would be fundamental change pertaining to industries. In social context, however, we cannot go by the meaning of the word but by its spirit just as in law what is more important is the spirit and not the word.

The expression 'industrial revolution' attained popularity as a result of its celebrated use by Arnold TOYNBEE. Not that the expression was not used before. There is evidence to the effect that it was used by JEVONS much earlier. Arnold TOYNBEE used the expression to describe the industrial and agrarian changes "at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the ninteenth centuries".[1] Several others have used the expression in the same sense and denote the same period. For instance M. MANTOUX has used it.

TOYNBEE was fully aware of the fact that the Industrial Revolution was not a sudden outburst. Forces were long since at work to bring about the industrial revolution. It was the outcome of a process. Still the changes brought about by its working in the social fabric were of such a radical nature that the term 'revolution' was used.

Earlier we have noted how capitalism had been infiltrating the social system right from feudal times. The force of capital loosened the feudal shackles. So also the ever growing power of capital was responsible for tightening the control of owners of capital over production to the detriment of craftsmen. The tendency was gaining everyday. Capi-

1. Arnold TONYBEE *"The Industrial Revolution In The Eighteenth Century In England"*, p. 1.

tal could exert considerable influence over the relations of production. Social relationships were coloured by the force of capital for instance the relationship between the owner and a mere labourer. Things had not, however, come to such a pass that capital was the only power. Even under the domestic system of production the worker had a considerable amount of freedom. The ever increasing use of money reduced the importance of skill. For with the help of money skill could be hired. The adoption of machinery for production rendered skill as of not much consequence. Even an ordinary workman could produce the same thing with the help of machine. Not that the skilled and the unskilled labourers were reckoned to be on a par, but certain privileges exclusive to the skilled were dispensed with.

Thus the expression Industrial Revolution is used to designate a particular period since when the increasing use of machinery radically altered the entire social setup. The period of Industrial Revolution records certain fundamental changes. And to this extent the use of the expression is justified.

It is customary to regard the Industrial Revolution as complete by 1830. For it is argued that by that date the technique and structure of production had been completely changed. Nevertheless it is realized that the momentum of industrial revolution, far from having lost the force, gathered force from 1830.[2] I do not see much point in regarding a particular period as the completion of Industrial Revolution. For it is a continuous process. As yet it has not stopped. Though, of course, the essence of the process has been more or less the same from 1830. There has not been a change of kind in the social setup after its being affected by the working of the industrial revolution.

Taken in its literal sense, the expression 'industrial revolution' fails to convey the real significance. It was a phenomenon and that too very complex. The outcome was multifarious. Speaking in material terms, the industrial revolution effected an enormous increase in production. Socially, there were many changes brought about as a result of its working. Thus the cities gained importance to the detriment of villages. The social structure was affected. There was a change in the position of various classes. Some of them altogether disappeared. New ones were created in the sense that supreme importance came to be attached to them. The scheme of social valuation underwent transformation. It is in all this variety of happenings that the essence of the industrial revolution is to be sought. Dr. L. C. A. KNOWLES rightly warns us as regards the misinterpretation of the expression. She points out that the term industrial revolution does not mean rapid change but fundamental change.[3]

Fortunately enough there obtains a fair amount of unanimity of opinion as regards the factors which were responsible for bringing about industrialization and enhanced production in England from the middle of the eighteenth century.

The growth of population, inventions, prevailing political philosophy and abundance of capital are acclaimed as factors responsible for bringing about industrialization. TOYNBEE, CUNNINGHAM, L. C. A.

2. MEREDITH H. O. *"Economic History Of England"*, p. 231.
3. KNOWLES L. C. A. *"Industrial And Commercial Revolutions In Great Britain During The "Nineteenth Century"*, p. 79.

KNOWLES, TREVELYAN, to mention only the more famous writers, regard the operation of all these factors together as the cause of the industrial revolution.

It is estimated that the population of England and Wales increased by about fifty per cent between 1750 and 1801. It would not have been possible to work the machines effectively had the population remained stationary. TREVELYAN attributes this rise in population to the increase in birth rate as well as to the 'very reduced death rate'.[4] As a result of ever increasing openings to employment, people were better fed. Despite scandalously unequal distribution of amenities of life there was a rise in the comforts available to the generality of the population. Moreover advance in medical science helped to retard the death rate. The growing population gave impetus to increased production at least in the case of agricultural products. Thus the growth of population was in a sense the result of improved methods of production; and at the same time it was a factor leading to improved production.

It is customary to classify the various inventions. Thus they are divided into mechanical inventions and inventions in transport. None of the inventions by itself could have been so epochmaking. It is their joint working that rendered them so very important. The cumulative effect of those inventions is the prime cause of their efficacy. Mechanical inventions could be worked out as there was increased production of foodstuffs as a result of inventions in agriculture. Due to increased transport facilities higher production was rendered immediately marketable.

These inventions were facilitated by the spirit of the age. As a reaction to the Mercantilist doctrine of the supremacy of the state the new doctrine of the supremacy of the individual and his interests was gaining force. Actually it was a happy coincidence that the interests of the merchants and the state namely the balance of payments were the same. This is not, however, a point which needs bother us at the present juncture. The mercantilist doctrine advocated the subordination of the individual. The regulations were irksome and fetterred individual liberty. For a pretty long time resentment was felt by the public against the restrictions imposed on liberty of action. Moreover people had realized the inadequacy of such restrictions in bettering the lot of humanity. The trading monopolists did not grudge the restrictions as they were for their benefit only. But others who had to make a fresh start grudged it. MEREDITH points out that though on the eve of industrial revolution the majority of the governing class was not hostile to state restrictions, the organisers of industry certainly hated such restrictions.[5] French thinkers had idolized liberty. The fifteen miles of sea could not prevent the influx of those ideas in England. The doctrine of *Laissez Faire*—let him alone—caught the grip of peoples' mind. It was a triumph of emotion and not without good reasons. For the clamour against restrictions was based on the motive of betterment of the individual. ROUSSEAU, BENTHAM, Adam SMITH, McCULLOH, SENIOR, James MILL and RICARDO were the chief exponents of the doctrine of *laissez-faire*. Antirestrictionism dominated the social, political and economic life of the country.

4. TREVELYAN G. M. *"English Social History"*, p. 341.
5. MEREDITH H. O. *"Economic History Of England"*, p. 235.

The immediate repercussions of the same were conducive to the rapid industrialization and the prosperity consequent upon it. Repercussions in the longer run were not particularly happy. Later on they will be discussed.

Above all it was the abundance of capital which speeded up industrialization. Earlier developments bear ample testimony to the increasing power of capital. Capital gained by trade and commerce played a vital role. The domestic system of production was also affected by the power of capital. It would be certainly wrong to suggest that the industrial revolution meant the disappearance of the system of domestic production. There is ample evidence to prove that the domestic system of production obtained even in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The factory system had not spread over all the industries. Under the factory system the control of capital was immense. That is why a distinction is observed between a tool and a machine. A tool is within the reach of a craftsman whereas it is not possible for him to own a machine. A large amount of capital was needed to own machines. The factory system which entailed the use of machines rendered workman's skill impotent. Skill was no longer valued as it was not needed. A machine is much more regular than a human being and can bring out uniform production. The most important aspect of the industrial revolution was not the change in the technique of production, but the reduction of human being to a mere factor of production. Though the system of domestic production continued to obtain along with the factory system till late in the nineteenth century, the fundamental change as regards human relationships was effected. Thus Maurice DOBB remarks "the essence of the transformation was that change in the character of production which is usually associated with the harnessing of machines to non-human and non-animal power".[6] This meant the dependence of labour on capital eventually.

Much prior to the industrial revolution production was dependent on capital. The desire to earn profits had dominated the productive system. But adoption of machinery enhanced the power of capital. Inventions in transport rendered markets very wide. Naturally enough trading became the privilege of the big few. Only those who had command of the capital could capture markets.

The factory system further increased the control of the capitalist. For now it was easier to supervise over the work done. In fact the lack of such supervision was one of the evils of the domestic system. Henceforth the capitalist had to assme various roles. He was no longer a mere financier of industry. He had to supervise over the work, direct production in view of the market conditions. All this meant concentration of power.

Accounting for the occurrence of the Industrial Revolution first in Great Britain, Dr. KNOWLES observes that the 'ready command of capital' was one of the main factors.[7] This command of capital was the result of various factors. Trade and commerce helped the accumulation of capital. 'England had her colonies which could be exploited for the fur-

6. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 258.
7. KNOWLES L. C. A. *"The Industrial And Commercial Revolutions In Great Britain During The Nineteenth Century"*, p. 15.

therance of her prosperity. Improvements in methods of agricultural production, consequent upon the enclosure movement, provided capital. The banking facilities made capital readily available.

An inevitable sequel to the Industrial Revolution was the crowding of people in the towns. The factories attracted people. As a result of industrialization the handicrafts suffered. It was not possible for the handicrafts to compete with the mechanised industries. Whatever we may have to say about the evil effects of industrialization one fact remains unquestionably true and that is the decreasing costs of production as a result of large scale production. This fact meant that if he tried to work according to his old methods, his bargaining position was weakened. Maurice DOBB attributes the weakness of the labourer vis-a-vis the owner to the heterogeneous character of the labour populace. Social class consciousness was there, though the political consciousness was absent. It is a welknown fact that complete industrialization had not been obtained even by the second half of the nineteenth century. Production was made under two different systems: one the domestic and the other the factory. The labour force under the two systems was not on the same footing and as such could not see eye to eye. The problems that faced the two were unlike. Naturally no united organization was possible. This helped the strengthening of the hold of the owner.[8]

The factory mode of production rendered skill of no value. Human skill was substituted by machine. The nature of production required the labourer to devote all his time and energy. It was no longer possible for him to supplement his income with a side job. Besides the decay of cottage industries meant the discontinuance of women's earnings. The link between the country and the town was severed. As a result of enclosures and the fever of enlarging the size of the holdings, small peasants were ousted out of the land. Thus the supplementary source of income was cut. Henceforth there came about a complete divorce between the town and the country. The town labourer lost his stake in the country. This further exposed him to the perils of uncertainty of employment. Complete subordination ensued. A very wide gulf was created between the worker and the owner by the economic circumstances. The economic gain which ensued from the enclosures and enlarging of rural holdings was achieved at the cost of the small squires. They lost their independence and became subservient.

The increase in trade consequent upon revolution in production and transport was responsible for the growing influence of towns and cities. For the very basis of production was changed. "The closed economy broke down and industry and trade were put on an international footing".[9] All production came to be dictated by the needs of towns and cities. The whole economy came to be controlled by towns. However, this control over economy by the towns brought in its wake political and cultural influence on life.[10] Trading activities were carried on in cities on large scale. New towns and cities came into being, which were the centres of trade. The self-sufficiency of villages was completely broken. No employment was available in the villages. Owing to the decay of

8. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 265-66.
9. David GLASS *"The Town"*, p. 47.
10. Ibid, p. 51.

various rural industries as well as the decay of various types of work on the field the rural populace had to seek employment in big towns. This swelled number of inhabitants in the towns.

The balance had long back swung in favour of the cities and towns. The villages lost their importance and have never been able to regain it. The development of trade and commerce opened a very wide field to the professionals. As observed earlier the growth of the middle class is linked with the increasing use of money. Quite an army of occupations was opened due to the industrial developments. It becomes quite evident from figures given by YOUNG for 1769 as regards the constituents of population that the urban population had gained in number. HOBSON accuses YOUNG of the sin of omission of the landlords class. YOUNG gives the following figures :

(1)	Agricultural Classes	3,600,000.
(2)	Manufacturing Classes	3,000,000.
(3)	Commerce	700,000.
(4)	Professional	200,000.
(5)	Paupers	600,000.
(6)	Military and Official	500,000.

HOBSON is out to establish the productivity of agriculture. That is not the issue which needs concern us here. What we want to know is the growing importance of urban pursuits relatively to the rural ones. For instance there is no mention of the professionals class in G. KINGS's estimate.[11]

If we compare Gregory KING's estimate of the population in 1688 our thesis is established.

According to KING's figures, the agricultural classes, including freeholders, farmers, labourers, out servants, cottagers, and paupers numbered 4,265,000. Those engaged in manufacture were only 2,40,000. Commerce employed only 246,000.[12] The tendency of the growing importance of towns has been gaining and that too at a high speed.

Socially the most important outcome was the change effected in the position of various classes. It would be absurd to suggest that altogether new classes were created or that some of them became completely extinct. The upshot was the shift in the importance of various classes. It has been noted that the balance had tilted in favour of cities and towns. The village economy was toed to the urban. The control by the towns over the economy of the country as a whole was clearly responsible for the relegation of the village. The rural pursuits were less valued than the urban ones. Industries had gained an upper hand over agriculture. This fact is reflected in the disparity between the industrial and the agricultural wages, the former were certainly higher than the latter.

It is a welknown fact that the merchant capitalist comprised a very effective link between the actual producer and the market. The producer came to depend on merchant's capital as the size of the markets became larger and larger. This increased the hold of the merchant over industry. The development of banking and finance tightened the hold still further. The functions of the merchant capitalist increased. With the growing power of his capital he became the master of production and

11. HOBSON J. A. "*The Evolution Of Modern Capitalism*", pp. 42-43.
12. Ibid, pp. 42-43.

later on the owner of the production plant. The independent worker was reduced to the position of a mere wage earner. The fact that all this evolution was expected by the people does not belittle the importance of the final development which took place as a result of the industrial revolution. As very properly pointed out by MANTOUX the changes brought about were not sudden developments. Yet they were like hidden seeds, which blossomed suddenly after the Industrial Revolution.[13] Now what was this capitalist manufacturer class comprised of? It would certainly be wrong to suggest that it was recruited entirely from the merchant manufacturers. Equally well it was not a class which was recruited from the landlords. Nor was it composed of the aristocracy. It had diverse elements in it.

Prior to the Industrial Revolution there was no such class as merchant manufacturers. Actually there was no manufacturing class according to the Marxian meaning of the term. As pointed out by J. L. HAMMOND and Barbara HAMMOND, the Industrial Revolution threw doors open to adventurers, in contrast to the elimination of opportunities to small men by the agricultural revolution.[14] Thus the yeomen who were driven out from land or more correctly, who left land as it no longer held bright prospects for them formed some part of the new merchant-manufacturer class. The enclosure of land and the enlarging of the size of holdings by landlords stripped yeoman of his much coveted independence. The yeoman was never a rich class. It had only moderate means. The average annual income of a yeoman is estimated to have been in the neighbourhood of £80. Besides he was wont to supplement his income with the earnings of his wife and children from carding and spinning. As a result of industrialisation this source was cut.[15] Thus he had perforce to seek employment in industry. He could start his own industry with his moderate capital. The acquaintance which he had with industry stood him in good stead. Peel, FIELDEN, STRUTT, WILKINSON, WEDGWOOD, DARBY and RADCLIFFE came from the yeomen class. We should not however, exaggerate the democratic strain obtaining in the composition of the pioneers of factory industry. For very few of the above mentioned ones could found a really big concern. It was very difficult for anyone to rise to the top without initial possession of capital. Let alone those who came from the journeymen or wage earners. Maurice DOBB rightly accuses SMILES of exaggeration. For of the twenty eight persons mentioned by SMILES fourteen came from small property owners of yeomen, master weavers, school teachers, etc., six came from rich middle class and only eight from the working class.[16]

Landlords in the sense that they were landowners formed a part of the new class. Enterprising landowners exploited the opportunity of industrial development. The aristocratic owners rarely became employers. The lords indirectly helped the development of industrialisation by 'promoting internal development and communication'. Thus the Duke of Bridgewater brought about the joining up of his mines by digging

13. Paul MANTOUX *"The Industrial Revolution In The Eighteenth Century"*, pp. 487-489.
14. HAMMOND J. L. And Barbara HAMMOND *"The Town Labourer"*, p. 8.
15. Paul MANTOUX *"Industrial Revolution In The Eighteenth Century"*, p. 142.
16. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, pp. 278-279.

a canal. He was given warm tributes by Spencer WALPOLE in so many words: he "did perhaps more to promote the prosperity of this country than all dukes, marquishes and earls combined, who before his time had been born into the world."[17]

Though the capitalist manufacturing class was composed of diverse elements, it could rally its forces together where the interest of the class as such was at stake. For instance there was a stubborn opposition on the part of the class to the granting of facilities to labour. This united action can be understood in the light of GRETTON's analysis of the new aristocracy. GRETTON remarks that the new aristocracy was essentially a middle class affair. Obviously enough he means by the middle class those who earned money from banking and trade. Moreover he remarks that the new aristocracy could not be traced far back into antiquity.[18] Not that the new class did not possess plenty of riches but they did not belong to the old aristocracy namely the landed gentry.

The desire on the part of the landed interests to forge an alliance with the new class is sufficient evidence of its power. The landed aristocracy knew very well the way the wind was blowing. They made pact with the new class by entering into matrimonial alliances. It is a wel-known fact that the landed gentry apprenticed their sons in industry so that they may secure wealth. The readiness with which an alliance was brought about between the landed class and the new aristocracy explains the growing power of capital. The capitalist manufacturer reigned supereme. GRETTON goes to the length of characterizing the state as 'predominantly middle class'.[19] Through their wealth it was possible for them to get seats in the Parliament. Once again LORIA's thesis of connective institutions is proved. The triumph of the Whigs over the Tories is an eloquent testimony of the same. The Whigs chiefly concerned themselves with manufacturing and trade. Not that they were devoid of land. The Tories were on the other hand, mainly landed interests.

All said, it has to be noted that the new aristocracy was not quite happy about the social status accorded to it. It was striving to improve upon its social position. No better proof can be given than the purchase of extensive land on the part of the wealthy capitalist manufacturers. Of course they gained economically also as a result of the improved methods of agricultural production.

There are certain facts which go to prove that this class, 'a child of yesterday', was of no account in the social scale. Despite their wealth and power which came with their control over a number of persons, they were not treated on a par with the landed aristocracy socially. The very fact that there is no mention even made of anyone belonging to this class in the list of English worthies of the eighteenth century drawn up in 1805 shows how it was reckoned. MANTOUX seeks the explanation of this in the fact that this class was held in contempt by the aristocracy and hated by the lower class.[20] Yet their importance or rather value (usefulness) to the society was certainly recognised. Some of them

17. HAMMOND J. L. And Barbara HAMMOND *"The Town Labourer"*, pp. 10-11.
18. GRETTON G. L. *"The English Middle Class"*, p. 192.
19. Ibid, p. 192.
20. Paul MANTOUX *"Industrial Revolution In The Eighteenth Century"*, p. 403.

worked on various committees right along with the old aristocrats. It was in vogue then not to look down upon crafts. The learning of a trade by sons of members of best families was the current fashion. Lord CHATHAM is reported to have said that his son-in-law Lord STANHOPE could earn his living as a blacksmith.

Then again art was highly valued. Thus producers of luxuries like WEDGWOOD were patronized by the aristocracy. MANTOUX is inclined to ascribe this to the old tradition of patronizing of art and luxuries by the aristocracy. However, he quotes further an instance where the person was highly treated even though he was more of a manufacturer than an aritst. George III received Bolton several times.[21]

It may seem rather arbitrary to draw distinct lines as far as social classes are concerned. But such a procedure facilitates analysis. Next to the capitalist manufacturing class stands the professional class—a thorough middle class. GRETTON's study of the *English Middle Class* has revealed the most important characteristic of this class namely its dependence on money. Earlier observations prove that there is more than a modicum of truth in GRETTON's thesis. Thus the professionals as a class was properly recognised with the increasing use of money. Prior to the industrial revolution there was limited scope for the activities of the professionals. With the development of high finance and banking new vocations were created. Even at the beginning of the eighteenth century the vocations of medicine, law and church are mentioned as being fit for gentlemen. The exclusion of teaching can be explained by the then current conception of treating it as a part of the services of the church.

As a concomitant of industrialization new vocations came into being. Flood-gates were opened. Accountants, legal advisors, chemists, physicists, engineers were needed. The increasing wealth afforded better facilities of education. Naturally education gained prominence. There was a demand for teachers. No longer was education looked down upon as it had been earlier. The decay of landowners who had regarded education as fit only for sons of rustics, put an end to its degraded position.[22] Due to concentration of people in towns and the lack of proper housing accomodation, the general standard of health of the people was affected adversely. Diseases spread more easily. Besides the interests of the employers demanded a certain minimum standard of health on the part of the workers. Hence doctors who had already been there were required more and more. Land was being put to absolutely new uses. This necessitated the services of surveyors, auctioneers and estate managers. The duties of government increased manifold as a result of the unprecedented widening of social organisation.[23] Thus an army of civil servants was needed to cope up with the new work.

It is singular and unfortunate that no statistics are available as to the remuneration of these professionals separately. We get the total amount earned by the whole class of professionals as such. Thus ac-

21. Ibid, pp. 405-406.
22. GRETTON G. L. "*The English Middle Class*", pp. 167-168.
23. CARR-SAUNDERS And WILSON "*The Professions*", p. 297.

cording to PITT's estimate the income of the professionals was two million pounds in 1798.[24]

Another noteworthy result of industrialization was that henceforth gentility could be purchased. During the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries a distinction was observed between gentlemen and plebians. This is clear from the admission registers of colleges. The majority of the students who matriculated are described as "pleb fil" (son of plebian). Plebian means without family and title. Some of them were of course "gen fil" (son of a man with gentle birth). Then again some were "arm fil", meaning thereby that they were the sons of men entitled to bear arms. "Cler fil" are mentioned—sons of men in holy orders. By the latter half of the eighteenth century a remarkable change occurred. The bulk of the entries were "gen fil", though of course, there was a "pleb fil" here and there.

This is sufficiently indicative of the changing ideas of gentility. Gentility henceworth did not represent family or rank but "a certain command of the conveniences and luxuries of existence".[25] Those who could obtain sufficient amount of wealth could pass off as gentlemen.

With the increase in industrialisation and liberation of credit the professionals could rid themselves of the shackles of dependence. The early lawyer is reported to have fed and slept at the feudal manor. Independence came as a result of economic betterment. GRETTON attributes the eighteenth century patronage of artistic and literary pursuits to the growth of wealth.[26]

Logical analysis compels us to rank the skilled labourers next to the professionals. The difference in their wages and the wages of unskilled labourers is not the only reason why we rank them higher than the ordinary labourers. Carrie GLASSIER poses the problem as to how to differentiate between the skill of automobile mechanics and bootblacks. According to GLASSIER the problem can best be solved only by considering the differences in the wages of the two. He himself admits that the reasoning is obviously circular.[27] We should not despair, however. There is certainly a better method of differentiating skilled labour from unskilled labour. The proof of the pudding lies in its eating, likewise the proof of this differentiation can be discerned from social valuations. Now of course, social valuations must always be studied with reference to the stage of development. For instance a trade which may have required some amount of skill before the advent of machines may not require any skill once machines are there. One point is, however, common through all the time and that is the factor of opportunity to rise. An upward movement is possible only to skilled workers. The unskilled labourer ends almost where he started. Despite the introduction of machinery there has always been room for skill. What we mean by saying that machinery displaced or substituted skill is that the skill in handicrafts has been substituted to some extent. For even to work machines some amount of skill is necessary.

24. GRETTON G. L. "*The English Middle Class*", p. 213.
25. Ibid, p. 204.
26. Ibid, p. 229.
27. Carrie GLASSIER "*Wage Differentials*", p. 18.

Moreover as far as the period under examination is concerned the skilled labourer was not confined to the position of mere labourer. In many cases the skilled worker was both a labourer and an employer of labourers right till the second half of the nineteenth century. Maurice DOBB, decrying the heterogeniety of labour and its weakness vis-a-vis the employers mentions this fact of no mean importance. Thus he remarks "in fact the skilled worker of the middle nineteenth century tended to be in some measure a sub-contractor, and in psychology and character bore the marks of this status".[28]

Another distinguishing mark between the skilled worker and the unskilled worker was that the former could read and write whereas the latter in many cases could not even read, let alone write.

By 1831 a typical skilled workman in London was neither brewer nor a shipwright but either a member of the building trades or a shoemaker, tailor, cabinetmaker, printer, jeweller, clockmaker, baker. These were considered as the main trades, each of which had more than 2500 members. The building trade was considered as the most important as well as the largest trade excluding agriculture. Total number of bricklayers, masons, carpenters, plasterers, slaterers, house-painters, plumbers and glaziers is estimated to have been 203,000 in 1831.

By 1851 half the population was urban. CLAPHAM maintains that during 1830 and 1850 the money wages of labour were stationary. A war-time rise, post-war fall, less than the rise and then a comparative stability has been the 'general formula' between 1790-1850. The building trades will be dealt with first as they were not directly affected by the revolution in technique. At the end of the eighteenth century a bricklayer was getting only 3s. 9d. per day, whereas in the 'dearest years of the war' he was getting 5s. 6d. per day. It has never again gone below 5s. The bricklayers' labourer who got on an average 2s. 4½d. per day in 1786-1806 was paid 4s. in 1811 and 3s. 6d. in 1831.

The breeches-maker who is considered as a highly skilled worker, was also unaffected by new revolution. Thus skill was yet recognised and valued. Francis PLACE, the chief exponent of this trade stated that in his trade wages rose from 22s. (per week) in 1793 to 36s. at the end of the wars. He further regarded this course of wages as common to all skilled trades. And his statement is borne out by facts. Compositors wages rose from 24s. (per week) in 1785 to 36s. in 1810, but were brought down to 33s. after the war.

No wonder that the problem of wages in trades affected by the revolution became intricate as there were changes effected in work. Thus old mill-wrights who were getting 42s. (per week) in 1813 were broken by the introduction of the 'engineer's economy' which meant specialisation and piece-rates whereas formerly they were not working at piece-rates. New conditions were imposed.

In an engineering work the nature of whose work had least changed was the iron moulder. The wage he got was 34s. 8d. per week in 1816. In 1832 the maximum he got was 30s. and in 1834 it was 34s. A maximum of 36s. was reached in 1845-46, but it was never maintained.

A turner at Manchester got 30s. (per week) in 1813; 26s. in 1820; 30s. in 1826 and upto 33s. in 1845; then it went down to 30s.

28. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 266.

The question of wages in the textile industries is naturally most complex as due to technical revolution, machine was replacing machine. A third grade male spinner who turned out coarse yarn first on jenny and then on the mule made 24s. (per week) at the end of the wars; 22s. 6d. in 1833; 21s. in 1836 and 16s. 5d. in 1839. In 1849 he made 18s. The introduction of the self-actor can be accounted for the decline in his wages.

On the other hand a first class fine spinner got 44s. (per week) in 1815; 35s. 9d. in 1833; 42s. 3d. in 1839—the year when the third grade spinners were having a very bad time. The minimum he got in the forties was 28s. 4d. in 1848 and maximum of 37s. in 1849.

As a result of new innovations the cotton hand-loom worker was crushed. In the twenties Manchester weavers were making 9s. (per week) in a good year and 6s. 6d. in a bad year, if at all they were at work. The situation was certainly very dangerous.

Outside the cotton industry, hand-loom workers were sufferring the same fate. Thus at Marfield the wages of weavers of common narrow woolen cloth had averaged only 5s. 6½d. each per week for a period of one year. Linen weavers at Barnsley got only 7s. 8½d. per week even when trade was good.

In skilled work as damask or heavy work as sailcloth wages were naturally higher. Silk-velvet weavers in London got 17s. a week. But plain silk and satin weavers got only between 7s. 5d. to 5s. 11d.

At Leeds the earnings of fine broad cloth weavers averaged 12 s. 9d. per week—the best man made £ 1 a week whereas the worst man made 7s. 6d. only. On about one thousand woolen-looms at Galashiels, Hawick and Jedburgh the weekly wages were between 11s. to 16s. 6d.

Coal-mining was not a first rank trade, if size be the consideration, in 1831. By 1851 it came to be ranked as such, the number of adult male colliers in Great Britain being 150,000. In the ninetees of the eighteenth century a miner in Northumberland got 2s. 6d. a day. In 1834 the average weekly earning of a miner in the same district was 15s. to 20s. (3s. 4d. to 4s. 5d. per day). An average of 4s. 3d. obtained for the decade in Staffordshire; 3s. 9d. a day for Durham in 1839.

CLAPHAM, taking the bird's eyeview of wages during 1790 to 1850, comes to the conclusion that wages had risen for every class of urban or industrial labour, barring such exceptions as dying and handloom trades, during the sixty years. In some cases they had risen by more than 50 per cent, but taking the fortunate as well as the unfortunate trades into account they had risen by 40 per cent.[29]

Some more statistics are available from Sir Robert GIFFEN's valuable work "Economic Inquiries and Studies". Sir Robert GIFFEN has reproduced the tables of wages in Lancashire Mills given by Mr. LORD. president of the Manchester Chamber Of Commerce. (Appendix, part I to 2nd report or Royal Commission on Trade Depression p. 377. Cotton M. Spinning and Weaving). Earnings of various types of workers, of course engaged in cotton spinning and weaving are given. Seven types are mentioned : (1) Stripper and grinders, (2) Rovers, (3) Minders,

29. All the statistics on wages given above has been taken from: CLAPHAM J. B. *"Economic History Of Britain—An Early Railway Age"*, pp. 70, 72, 536, 548-554, 558-561.

(4) Winders, (5) Weavers, (6) Mechanics and (7) Overlookers and tacklers. The average weekly earnings of those workers varied from time to time. In 1850 the strippers and grinders earned 11s. per week, whereas in 1860 they earned 14s. The Rovers got 7s. 6d. per week in 1850, while they got 11s. in 1860. Minders received 18s. per week in 1850 and in 1860 they got same amount. Winders got in 1850 8s. 6d. per week whereas in 1860 there was an increase of 6d. only. The Weavers got only 8s. 2d. per week in 1850 whereas in 1860 they got as much as 14s. 9d. The mechanics got £ 1-1s. per week in 1850, there was an increase of 3s. in 1860. Overlookers and tacklers got £ 1-1s. in 1850 and £ 1-5s. in 1860. From these figures it can be clearly seen that difference was made in the wage of skilled and ordinary labourers. Skill was valued and it was also rare. According to the primary laws of Economics "scarcity implies value". This can be clearly discerned if we take the number of the various types of workers dealt with above, into account. Thus the number of persons employed as Strippers and grinders was 10. Rovers were 16; minders 52; winders 60; weavers 330, whereas there were only 10 overlookers and tacklers and only two mechanics.

We get information about wages paid in chemical works. The Record of wages paid at the Newcastle chemical works from 1840-1885 is reproduced by Sir Robert on p. 184. This was a statement of Mr. ALLHUSEN, Appendix to third *report of Royal Commission on Trade Depression*, p. 307. The chemical works had five types of workers—(1) Blacksmiths, (2) Millwrights, (3) Bricklayers, (4) Joiners and (5) Labourers. The weekly earnings are given. Thus Blacksmiths received 20s. in 1840, 22s. in 1850, 24s. in 1855 and 26s. in 1860. There has been an increase in their earnings. The Millwrights earned 21s. in 1840, 23s. in 1850, 25s. in 1855 and 27s. in 1860. Here also there was an increase in their earnings. Bricklayers got 20s. in 1840, 22s. in 1850, 24s. in 1855 and 29s. in 1860. The same rising tendency can be observed here. The Joiners got 18s. in 1840, 20s. in 1850, 22s. in 1855 and 24s. in 1860. The rise in wages seems to be the common rule. The Labourers earned between 12s. to 13s. in 1840, 14s. in 1850, 14s. to 15s. in 1855 and between 16s. to 18s. in 1860. The tendency of rise in wages seems to be universal in these works. Here also a clear cut distinction was observed between the skilled and the ordinary worker. Thus labourer gets the lowest wages, whereas the blacksmith, the millwright, the bricklayer and the joiner whose work need certain amount of skill were paid highly.[30]

II

The term agricultural revolution is used to signify not merely a change in the technique of production or an increase in production, but to point out a fundamental change in social relations, which it was responsible for bringing about. With the improvement in productive methods production increased by leaps and bounds. The advance of science made for the adoption of better methods. The increasing use of mechanical implements facilitated increase in the produce. The use of manures and nitrates rendered the soil fertile.

30. Sir Robert GIFFEN, "*Economic Inquiries And Studies*", Vol. I, pp. 181 and 184.

But could this have been effected had the enclosures not been made? Could such improvements be within the means of a small peasant farmer? We know fully well that before the enclosure of land on a large scale had taken place England was a country where land was divided into several strips. Common land was there, wherefrom anybody could eke out a part of his living. Even those who did not own any piece of land could eke out a living by hiring strips of land. A farm labourer could hope to buy land gradually out of his savings.

The rural society was constituted of the lord of the manor, the free-holder who is popularly known as the yeoman, tenant-farmers, cottagers, farm servants and squatters. The last three lived as labourers. Now "the most important social fact about this system is that it provided opportunities for the humblest and poorest labourer to rise in the village".[31] Upward movement was comparatively much easier in the village before the enclosure.

Enclosure of the commons was not a new evil in the eighteenth century. It had been going on since the sixteenth century. It had not, however assumed such dimensions as it did in the eighteenth century. The development of trade and manufacturing meant more wealth. The new manufacturing class purchased land to attain social prestige. Landlords henceforth came to be recruited from this new class. Moreover the development of new technique of production rendered agriculture productive. It was certainly advisable to bring more and more land under cultivation under the new method. Hence the tightening up of the enclosures and enlarging the size of the farms.

Besides it was beyond the means of a small farmer to incur the expenditure of enclosures. He had to give way before the rising tide of enclosures and the enlarging of the size of farms which were going on simultaneously. He was degraded to the position of a labourer.

Landed property henceforth came to be concentrated in the hands of a few. The yeoman gradually vanished. The small farmer was immediately swept away. The independence of the cottager, the squatter and the labourer was lost never to be regained. The inevitable result of the industrial revolution was the decay of domestic industries. Hence the support of the farmer and the labourer was cut.

The Napoleonic wars gave fresh impetus to increased production of food and thus to the concentration of ownership of land. The supply of corn from outside was cut off. The home producers reaped a rich harvest. The passing of Corn Laws gave additional fillip to agriculture. This meant prosperity of the owner of land.

Public resentment against the corn laws was gathering force. No longer did the interests of the landlords coincide with the interests of the nation as a whole. The manufacturers wanted cheap food for the labourers which meant free imports of food. The labouring populace was hardpressed by the increased prices of food stuffs. It requires no deep knowledge of economics to say that food material constitutes the biggest item of those who are paid lowest. The balance had swung in favour of industry. The new captains of industry, manufacture and trade were powerful enough to enact laws to suit their interests.

31. J. L. HAMMOND and Barbara HAMMOND *"The Village Labourer"*, p. 9.

The repeal of the corn laws did not, however, hit agriculture as hard as might be feared. This was due to a number of reasons. Sheer distance accounted for some protection. COBDEN calculated protection of 10s. a quarter to the English farmer as arising out of sheer distance, "that being the cost of freight and insurance of wheat from Danzig to these shores".[32] Moreover the plausible competitors of England namely Germany, France, Russia and the U.S.A. were preoccupied with war and as such could not compete with her. Actually the period between 1850-1870 was the period of highest prosperity of English Agriculture.

This prosperity was not shared by all sections of the rural community. The landlords of course reaped a rich harvest. The independent farmer had been reduced to the position of a tenant farmer. He suffered as higher wages had to be paid. The labourer suffered as he had lost supplementary income. Moreover there was a marked tendency, since the industrial revolution, of rural wages being smaller than the industrial wages. MANTOUX maintains that this tendency was at work even before the industrial revolution. MANTOUX gives comparative figures of wages. In 1770 a day labourer (rural) earned 5s. to 6s. a week in winter and 7s. to 9s. in summer. He earned as much as 12s. in harvest time, but unfortunately that was for a very short time and in certain localities only. At the same time a cotton weaver at Manchester earned 7s. to 10s. a week. A Leeds cloth weaver earned about 8s. A Braintree dugget weaver earned 9s. A Witney blanket weaver got 11s. or more. Wool weavers no doubt due to their skill but also as a result of theirs being well organised easily earned 13s. a week. Furnace-keepers at Horsehay earned nearly 12s. a week. Blacksmiths at Rotherham got 13s. a week. Sheffield cutters got 13s. 6d. Miners at Newcastle earned 15s.[33] This disparity between the wages of agricultural labourer and industrial labourer went on increasing as years passed by.

The rural labourers or to use Marxian terminology the rural proletariat which was the direct outcome of the agricultural revolution, had a bad time after the Napoleonic wars. The patriarchal relations between landlord and labourers had died out. Wages fell to the minimum as a result of competition among labourers. Their condition was so bad that an English agricultural labourer and an English pauper had become synonymous terms by 1830.[34]

It is seen how as a result of the enclosures the labourer was robbed of the strip of land he had tilled. Formerly he could get fuel from the commons. So also could he maintain poultry and a cow, which could be fed on the commons. Not only was he deprived of this but also of his wife's and child's earnings as a result of the decay of domestic industries. His position was rendered all the more serious by an increase in prices. It is calculated that whereas the prices of provisions had gone up by 60 per cent wages had appreciated only by 25 per cent. According to Professor LEVY's estimate wages rose by 60 per cent between 1760 and 1813 whereas the price of wheat rose by 130 per cent during the same period.[35]

32. KNOWLES L. C. A. *"Industrial And Commercial Revolutions In Great Britain During The Nineteenth Century"*, p. 370.
33. Paul MANTOUX *"Industrial Revolution In The Eighteenth Century"*, pp. 431-432.
34. Fredric ENGELS *"Conditions Of The Working Class In 1844"*, p. 264.
35. HAMMOND J. L. And Barbara HAMMOND *"The Village Labourer"*, p. 87.

According to the table quoted by BRIGGS[36] and prepared by A. L. BOWLEY the weekly earnings of agricultural labourers were as follows : between 1767-70—7s. 3d.; in 1795—9s.; 1824—9s. 6d.; 1832—10s. 3d.; 1837—10s. 3d.; 1851—9s. 7d.; 1860—11s. 7d. and 1870—12s. 5d.

A mere study of wages of agricultural labourer will not give sufficient information about his actual position in society. It will have to be supplemented by studying social opinion about him and his place in the society. It is a welknown fact that the agricultural revolution brought about the isolation of the poor. The break up of the old village life was responsible for destroying the companionship of the rich and the poor. In the old village they knew each other and there was not much of a difference in the kind of life they led.

It would be interesting to know the attitude of the ruling classes towards the poor. PITT refuses to take up the reform of Poor Law on the ground of his ignorance of the conditions of the poor. This reflects complete indifference on his part. Fox deplored the fact of the dependence of the poor on the rich class.

COBBET was wonderstruck to learn of the substitution of the term 'commons of England' by such names as 'the lower orders', 'the peasantry' and 'the population'. He was pained to note this change in the attitude of the rich towards the poor in the span of his life.[37]

Friedrick ENGELS quotes a letter from the Manchester Guardian wherein a lady has expressed her genuine resentment about the main streets of towns being haunted by beggars. Her main grievance was that inspite of paying heavily for the poor rates the town areas were not free from the ghastly sight of suffering beggars. This can easily illustrate the attitude of the rich bourgeoise towards the poor. ENGELS trenchantly remarks that the English bourgeoisie was charitable out of self interest and not out of altruistic motives.[38]

III

The repercussions of the industrial revolution and the agricultural revolution have already been noted. Indirectly the interconnexion between the two has also been noted. It is but natural that the discussion of the industrial revolution necessitates that of the agricultural revolution, both being two different aspects of social revolution.

Taking the risk of repetition, it should be stated that the industrial revolution vitally effected the speeding up of the agricultural revolution. The industrial revolution, bringing in its wake industrialization and increasing the hold of capital, was responsible for bringing about the decay of domestic production. A small peasant could no longer supplement his paltry income with the earnings of his wife and children as a result of the decay of domestic production. It was this economic blow that weakened his position. Thus he had to submit to the landlord his piece of land. As a result of the introduction of mechanical implements in farming, human labour came to be substituted by machinery and aggravated the weakness of peasants. Besides the money earned from

36. BRIGGS M. *"Economic History Of England"*, p. 339.
37. HAMMOND J. L. And Barbara HAMMOND *"The Village Labourer"*, p. 187.
38. ENGELS F. *"The Condition Of The Working Classes In 1844"*, p. 278-279.

trade and industry was employed in agriculture to effect improvements and increase production. We have noted how the new manufacturing capitalist class purchased extensive land to secure a niche in the social hierarchy, of course this action of this class cut both way. Incidentally we may note here enertia in social valuations. Social prestige was earned while economic gains also ensued as a result of improved methods of agricultural production. There was a double gain. The landlords knew for certain that henceforth they could not effectively compete with the new manufacturing capitalist class. Hence they resorted to enlarging the size of their farms in order to consolidate their position.

In a way the agricultural revolution may be said to have effected the pace of the industrial revolution. Had it not been for increased production, it would have been very difficult to concentrate factory workers in towns and cities. For the factory workers would have had to devote a part of their time and energy to produce food. The divorce between the town and the country could not have been effected without increased food production.

It has already been noted that the balance tilted in favour of industry. Agriculture was relegated to a subordinate position. This can be clearly discerned from the supremacy of the new aristocracy over the old. I am purposely using the word new and not the word industrial. For we have seen that the new aristocracy namely the manufacturing capitalist class was composed of diverse elements. The industrialists were there, the landed interests were there as well as the trading interests.

The country had to make a choice between industry, manufacture and trade on the one hand and agriculture on the other. The fateful choice was made in favour of the former. Consequently agriculture was relegated to an inferior position. Fredrick ENGELS thus remarks "the reform bill of 1831 had been the victory of the whole capitalist class over the landed aristocracy".[39] Similarly the repeal of the Corn Laws was the victory of the manufacturers over the landed aristocracy. The interests of the landlords no longer coincided with those of society as a whole. The main source of wealth to the country was industries. And the industries needed shipping to import material and export their products. Thus export of grain was cast into background. Cheap food was essential to maintain army of workers. CUNNINGHAM sums up the whole situation by saying that "the public interest no longer coincide with the private interests of the landlord class........it had come to be closely associated with the private interest of the manufacturer".[40] Thus the new aristocracy gained supremacy over the old. BRIGGS has very appropriately styled it the aristocracy of wealth.[41]

Earlier we have had occasion to mark the disparity between the wages of an industrial labourer and those of a rural labourer. The position of the agricultural labourer was getting worse and worse. The effect of the introduction of machinery in agricultural operations was

39. Ibid, preface, p. XII.
40. CUNNINGHAM *"The Growth Of English Trader Commerce", Modern Times Part II Laissez Faire*, p. 729.
41. BRIGGS M. *"Economic History Of England"*, p. 187.

the driving away of women labourers from agriculture into industry. Dr. KNOWLES observes that the position of the agricultural labourers would have been worse had there been no opening of a large prospect to them as navvies, porters and railway officials on account of the railways.[42] But the fundamental fact remains undisputed and that was his being driven away from the land.

It would be much better if a retrospective review of the effects of the two revolutions is made. Two different dates are chosen—the beginning of the nineteenth century and the end of its third quarter. These dates are chosen so as to clearly bring out the impact of the industrial revolution and the agricultural revolution. By the first date the revolutions had just started. By the second date they were long complete.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century Patric COLQUHON made a rough estimate of the national income. He also apportioned the same to various classes. According to a very able summary of the same by Messrs COLE and POSTGATE, we get the followig results[43] :

		£
1.	Aristocracy (Nobility, Gentry, Royalty, Upper Clergy not including next group)	60,000,000
2.	State Service and Pensions	8,000,000
3.	Professions (Rest of Clergy, Law and Medicine)	17,000,000
4.	Agriculture (landholders apart from aristocracy, including freeholders farmers, but not labourers)	74,000,000
5.	Trade and Industry (excluding innkeepers and publicans, and also wage earners)	37,000,000
6.	Innkeepers and Publicans	9,000,000
7.	Working Classes (artisans, labourers, miners, etc., including agricultural labourers)	82,000,000
8.	Paupers, Vagrants and Criminals	10,000,000
	Total Income	£ 297,000,000

It is quite clear, thus that the working class, even if the last group is included therein, received not even one-third of the national income. The aristocracy received the lion's share if its receipts from public offices and pensions are considered. The agricultural class, excluding aristocracy as well as landlords and labourers received almost 25 per cent. The whole trading and industrial class received only 15 per cent, working class excluded. This table effectively brings out the importance attached to agriculture.

The same authors quote Dudley BAXTER's estimate of the incomes of various classes. These figures published in 1867 can give us a fair picture of social stratification, obtaining in mid-victorian England. Only about ten million people who received income are dealt with. The figures are for England and Wales. More than ten million people who had no independent income of their own are excluded. The groups are[44]:—

42. KNOWLES L. C. A. *"Industrial And Commercial Revolutions In Great Britain During The Nineteenth Century"*, p. 371.

43. COLE and POSTGATE *"The Common People"*, p. 141.

44. Ibid, p. 347.

	Class	Income p.a.	Number of recipients.	
1.	Upper	Over £5,000	7500	
				49,500
2.	Upper	£1000-£5000	42,000	
3.	Lower Middle	£100-£300	850,500	
				1,853,500
4.	Lower Middle	Under £100	1003,000	
5.	Middle	£300-£1000	150,000	
6.	Skilled Labour		1,123,000	
7.	Less Skilled Labour		3,819,000	7,785,000
8.	Agricultural Workers and unskilled Labour Class[1]		2,843,000	

1. of whom about 1,000,000 were agricultural workers.

Despite the fact that there are certain lacunae to be discerned in BAXTER's groups, for instance his grouping together of all non-manual workers among the lower-middle-class irrespective of their incomes and his grouping together of adults as well as non-adults (of course earners), it must be said to be fairly representative of the social structure and income of the various classes.

Moreover we can tally our observations about the class structure and differences in the incomes of various classes. In general terms our observations tally with BAXTER's groups. Our thesis that difference in social classes, which clearly reveal social stratification, and differences in incomes go together is proved and thus established.

IV

Earlier it has been noted that the policy of *Laissez Faire* was one of the factors which quickened the pace of industrialization and brought prosperity to the nation. The development of the factory system of production brought in its wake certain evils for instance the employment of children, overcrowding in the cities and towns, insanitary living conditions, etc. Despite the plea on the part of the industrialists for full freedom of action, public resentment was gathering force. As a sequel to the public resentment and the growing humanitarianism factory acts were passed which put restrictions on hours of work. Gradually opinion was gaining ground that it was the prime duty of the state to intervene in private matters of industrialists where the welfare of the community at large was at stake. Laws were passed delimiting the hours of work and ensuring minimum sanitary conditions. It would, however, be too much to suggest that the factory acts passed reflected the observance of a general principle right from the beginning. In most of the cases such enactments were necessitated by the force of circumstances. The factory act of 1802 is a case in point. As epidemic had broken out, which resulted in the death of many apprentices employed in the cotton mills. Hence certain action on the part of the state to ensure sanitary conditions. Thus as trenchantly observed by DICEY, "the measure was suggesed not by any general principle, but by the needs of the moment".[45] Nonetheless, the factory legislation did bring about a fundamental change

45. DICEY A. V. "*Law And Public Opinion In England*", p. 109.

in the public policy. At first sight it might appear that the factory legislation did not mean anything more than protection from over work of persons engaged in factories. A very significant outcome of the factory legislation is embodied in the establishment of the principle of State control of public labour.[46] Moreover extraneous factors were also responsible in moulding the State policy. Right upto the seventies of the nineteenth century the country enjoyed a period of prosperity. People came to have implicit faith in the law of progress. Production increased by leaps and bounds. The general standard of living had increased considerably, making allowance for large inequalities of income. As a concomitant of inventions in machinery and transport the size of the markets increased. Trading with overseas markets was rendered feasible. There seemed to be no limits to prosperity. However, the size of the markets always imposes limit on the extension of trade. The prosperity enjoyed by the people could not last for ever. As very rightly pointed out by Maurice DOBB "the economic situation of the hundred years between 1775 and 1875 was no more than a passing phase in the history of capitalism, product of a set of circumstances which were destined, not only to pass, but in due course to generate their opposite, that in words of one recent writer, it "has been nothing else but a vast secular boom"."[47]

Earlier we have noted how the wars had affected continental nations and the U.S.A. England was thus saved from effective competition from abroad as far as her agriculture was concerned. Same can be said about her industries. This is in a way a negative reasoning. Maurice DOBB, however, points out that not only was England free from competition from abroad, but also that it gained directly from industrial development abroad and especially the development of railways. English capital was invested in foreign railways, which provided 'a profitable outlet for capital and also' stimulated 'the export of capital goods'.[48]

It was thus a hothouse prosperity, external competition being virtually absent. This could not go on for ever. The freeing of other countries from war made for increased production and thus shutting out of markets to England. The complacency of the English people was violently shaken by the setting in of agricultural depression in the seventies.

All this made for a change in the policy pursued by England. *Laissez-Faire* was no longer looked upon with favour. State action was deemed essential to save the situation.

The development of mechanical transport reduced the factor of distance considerably. Newer and newer markets were sought. There was a scramble for markets and thus for colonization. Continental countries tried to develop colonies so that they may secure permanent markets for their produce. England was forced to revise her policy in the face of such events. No longer could England afford to practise freedom of trade. England had to resort to pacts with her colonies and dependencies. This marks the beginnings of new Imperialism, which was to grow more and more in time to come.

46. Ibid, p. 239.
47. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 258.
48. Ibid, pp. 297-298.

CHAPTER III

MODERN PERIOD—IMPERIALIST ERA (1880-1939)

Plan Of The Chapter :

(I) Unity Of The Period Under Review And Analysis Of Imperialism.
(II) Theoretical Analysis Of The Class System In Modern Society.
(III) Social Classes And Differences In Income And The Relationship Between The Two.
(IV) Raison-detre Of The Class-System.

I

Prior to the discussion of the problem proper we include a brief note explaining the unity of the period under consideration. In discussing the earlier period we came across a plea to regard the period from 1760 to 1850 as a homogeneous unit. A similar plea is made by J. Hampden JACKSON to regard the period between 1815 and 1914 as a homogeneous unit. The author suggests that after the first great war changes of a radical nature had taken place so that "Englishmen found themselves living in a new world".[1] The author goes to the length of marking the working of the second Industrial Revolution. Nevertheless the author is not unmindful of the differences between the features of the two industrial revolutions. Thus he observes that the principle of *laissez-faire* which was the guiding principle of the first industrial revolution was replaced by state interference in the second revolution. Fundamentally we cannot accept this plea. For events do not permit us to do so. It was not after the first great war that the inadequacy and the inadvisability of the policy of *laissez-faire* was noted. In the last chapter we thave seen how complacency was shaken by the setting in of the depression in the seventies of the nineteenth century. The depression affected agriculture, industry as well as overseas trade. In fact it would be more correct to say that the depression was caused by the falling demand for exports. Maurice DOBB tells us that between 1867 and 1873, England's total exports had been larger by 80 per cent than they had been in 1860. Owing to the completion of railway projects in the U.S.A. there was demand for the export of iron and steel. By 1876 exports of British produce had gone down (in value) by 25 per cent from the peak reached in 1872. Exports to U.S.A. alone were halved.[2]

Hence the awakening on the part of the state to take measures to regain prosperity. Free trade was no longer in favour. Protectionism was resorted to. It was realized once for all that newer and newer markets had to be found if trade was to expand so that prosperity might continue. European markets offered only limited scope. Hence markets in the unexplored parts of the world had to be sought. Thus Africa was looked upon as a very useful outlet for English export trade. The indus-

1. J. Hampden JACKSON *"England Since The Industrial Revolution"*, p. 283.
2. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 309.

trial revolution in Germany which was completed by 1870 necessitated her to seek markets for export. Hence the scramble for colonies. England as well as Germany had realized that it was essential for them to control markets if they were to maintain prosperity. In order to exercise effective control over the markets certain political measures were taken. Political control was extended.[3] This marks the beginning of imperialism. The principle has remained the same, though of course there has been considerable development of the same during later period. It was from the seventies of the nineteenth century that the principle of economic imperialism took a definite shape.

LENIN regards imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism. And it is not without justification that he does so. Besides whether or not we accept Lenin's thesis in toto we must recognize the fact that the development of capitalism is conditioned by the size of the markets. The size of the markets imposes limits to the development of capitalism. It is precisely at this point that economic imperialism emerges as the saviour of capitalism. This fact can be evinced from 1880 s. Economic imperialism as a working principle can be seen to function from the depression of the seventies in the last century. Thus the period since 1880 to 1939 can be and should be regarded as presenting elements of unity. Principle has remained the same inspite of the changes in the intensity of its working. Events of to-day also evince the working of the same principle.

Socially speaking the division of society into various classes has been more or less the same from seventies of the last century to the present day. The importance attached to wealth, if anything, has increased. The source of wealth is no longer taken into account. The worship of the Mammon has been the common feature from 1880 s. The power of wealth has been accepted to be indisputable.

Political actions are taken to guard economic interests. Prima facie arguments of prestige, defence are given. But the principle working behind such moves is mainly economic. To quote latest instance we might consider Hitler's plea for Lebensraum (living space). It was not living space which was desired by HITLER. He wanted economic power which could be attained by gaining political control over colonies. And it is bound to be so, profit being the cardinal principle of a capitalist economy. Raw materials were imported in order to export manufactured goods. The difference between the prices of the two constituted profit. Hence the demand for colonies which could supply raw materials as well as furnish market for the finished products. This feature has been common since the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Culturally speaking all the aspects of modern civilization have been present since the eighties. Urbanisation was complete. All the characteristic features of an industrial society namely crowding in the cities, keen competition among workers, considerable social mobility, etc., have been there right from the eighties to the present day. The presence of all these aspects makes for unity of the period.

The beginning of imperialism can be logically associated with the proclamation of Queen Victoria as the Empress of India in 1876. The title adopted by the Queen is suggestive of future policy and events. The

3. HOBSON J. A. *"Imperialism A Study"*, pp. 80-81.

state was markedly out for increasing imperialist possessions. The effort was successful so that by 1900 quite a large area of land had been added to the British Empire. It has been estimated that no less than an area of 5,000,000, square miles, containing a population of at least 90,000,000, was added to the British Empire during the last quarter of nineteenth century.[4]

Joseph CHAMBERLAIN has been acclaimed as the pioneer of modern imperialism. This claim is undisputed. Eminent authors like FAY C. R., G. D. H. COLE, CROOME, HAMMOND, Maurice DOBB, H. O. MEREDITH, L. C. A. KNOWLES are agreed on this point. We should not lose sight of the background which was responsible for Chamberlain's success. The great depression of the seventies awakened the people to seek new markets for export. Other nations like Germany and France, 'bent on glory and commercial gain', were trying to establish their own empires. The purchase of shares of the Suez Canal was a step to consolidate the long-stretched empire in India. Joseph CHAMBERLAIN emphasized the importance of imperialism against the background of such conditions. He had clearly visualized the necessity of imperial unity to ensure markets. As colonial secretary he rendered signal service to his nation. The importance of colonies to the mother country had been vivdly grasped by him. "Plenty of Employment and a contented people go together, and there is no way of securing plenty of employment except by creating new markets and developing the old ones".[5] CHAMBERLAIN is reported to have said this. He rendered yeoman's service by making the colonies inhabitable to the English men. CHAMBERLAIN brought home to the government the necessity of giving protection to markets at home as well as 'create new markets' abroad and to raise his glass in simultaneous toast of "Commerce and Empire, because, gentlemen, the Empire, to parody a celebrated expression, is Commerce".[6] In his speech at Birmingham, CHAMBERLAIN declared that he "would never lose the hold, we now have over our great Indian dependency—by far the greatest and most valuable of all the customers we have". "For the same reason I approve of the continued occupation of Egypt; and for the same reason I have urged upon this Government........the necessity for using every legitimate opportunity to expand our influence and control in that great African continent which is how being opened up to civilization and commerce".[7]

Lord Rosebury was another staunch advocate of imperialism. He described the subjection of new territory to the British state as the fruitful means whereby "pegging out claims for posterity" could be effected.[8] Similarly Cecil Rhodes was an ardent advocate of imperialism. CHAMBERLAIN is reported to have Characterized imperialism as "true, wise and economical policy" Cecil Rhodes was by no means lagging behind as can be clearly discerned from his following remark "The Empire, as I have always said, is a question of the stomach. If you do not want civil war, you must become imperialists".[9]

4. COLE G. D. H. and Raymond POSTGATE "*The Common People* 1746-1938", p. 391.
5. FAY C. R. "*Great Britain From Adam Smith To The Present Day*", p. 82.
6. Maurice DOBB "*Studies In The Development Of Capitalism*", p. 311.
7. Ibid, Foot Note 2, p. 311.
8. Leonard WOOLFE "*Economic Imperialism*", p. 35.
9. V. I. LENIN "*Imperialism*" *The Highest Stage Of Capitalism*, p. 72.

LENIN gives us facts and figures about the growth of imperialism. Thus he gives figures for colonial possessions of the great powers. Though our primary concern is with the growth of British imperialism as such, it is instructive to study in brief such development of other powers like France and Germany. Thus England (including her possessions) in 1876 had an area of 22.5 millions of square kilometers with a population of 251.9 millions. While in 1914 the area increased to 35.5 million square kilometers, at the same time population was 3935 millions.The area of the home country was only 0.3 million square kilometers and population was 46.5 millions. France had in 1876 an area (including her colonies) 0.9 million square kilometers with a population of 6.0 millions. By 1914 the area was 10.6 million kilometers whereas the population was 55.5 millions. The area of home country was only 0.5 square kilometers. Germany in 1914 had colonies whose area was 2.9 million square kilometers and whose population was 12.3 millions. The area of the home country was only 0.5 million square kilometers with a population of 649 millions.[10]

All sorts of excuses are advanced to justify imperialist occupation of land. Thus military, economic or sentimental (prestige) arguments are made whenever acquisition of fresh land is to be made. European states have always found defence as a convenient excuse for annexing land. So also the necessity to safe-guard the economic interests of European subjects has been a common excuse. The sentimental excuse which is reflected in the concept of the 'white man's burden' has been used *ad nauseum*. The excuse has been long exploded. Hence it is no longer advanced. But behind all these excuses the working principle is mainly, if not purely, economic.

A study of British investments in foreign countries will bring home the importance of the economic aspect of imperialism. The primary characteristic of such investment is its privileged position. Differentiating between a political society and an industrial one Dr. Newell Leroy SIMS very aptly remarks that "political society involved expansion by militaristic or direct power imperialism, whereas industrial society resorts to economic penetration and commercial conquest, and thus comes to imperialism indirectly".[11] The capitalist system makes no apology for working for profit. In fact profit is the motive force behind capitalist trading. Production is undertaken for profit. Naturally enough such markets are sought where the highest possible profit can be reaped. It is an axiomatic truth that capitalist development is necessarily conditioned by the size of the market. With a capitalist economy in its full swing, it becomes imperative to seek markets in the outside world. Further, such an economy does not stop at this. Having sought markets she tries to restrict them for her own use alone. Privileged markets are sought. A sort of monopoly creeps in. This is precisely what England tried to do. The figures quoted below bear ample testimony to this statement. We start with the seventies of the last century. Here we reproduce the annual average of investment for the periods as given by Hampden JACKSON in his book : *"England since the Industrial Revolution."*

10. Ibid, p. 73.
11. Newell Leroy SIMS *"Sooiety And Its Surplus"*, p. 241.

Annual Average for the Period	Millions of Pounds
1870—74	61
1875—79	1
1880—84	24
1885—89	61
1890—94	46
1894—99	27
1900—04	21
1904—09	109
1910—13	185
1920—24	115
1925—29	99
1930—34	53[12]

These figures of investment abroad are not indicative of the British altruistic motives. They are clearly indicative of the spirit of profit. No other proof of this is needed when we consider J. S. Mill's statement, concerning the export of capital as early as the mid-nineteenth century, which runs as follows "I believe this (the export of capital) to have been for many years one of the principal causes by which the decline of profits in England has been arrested".[13] Additional proof of the same can be found in the fact that by 1900 British capitalists who had invested about £ 1,700,000,000, overseas could get by way of income (interest profit, etc.) at least £ 100,000,000.[14] Most of these investments were outside Europe. India absorbed quite a large part of the same. Other countries like the Argentine, Canada, Brazil, and the U.S.A. were also the recipients of English capital. So also by 1913 British overseas investments, which have been estimated to have averaged annually about £ 185,000,000, were bringing in to the investors "a net annual income of about £ 200,000,000, of which nearly all was being promptly reinvested abroad".[15]

And this had to be done if Britain had to maintain the rate of profits. Dr. N. L. SIMS trenchantly observes that "this industrial imperialism is an economic necessity, the natural outreach of accumulated energy, the propulsive power of unexpended surplus, the "manifest destiny", indeed of wealthy industrial societies".[16] It is the inevitable corollary of capitalism that surplus capital must be exported. This in its turn necessitates empire building. For it is only possible under imperial states to obtain concessions and privileges in matters of foreign investment and trade. Unlike the old empires, which had a purely political character, the modern empires are mainly economic. As such their powers are unlimited in their reach.

Such investments are usually made in weak countries. At any rate the countries where such investments were made were not politically on a par with England. Thus colonies, dominions and dependencies have always proved to be the fruitful avenues of investment. The mother country exercised a sort of political hegemony over colonies, dominions

12. Hampden JACKSON *"England Since The Industrial Revolution"*, p. 294.
13. Maurice DOBB *"Political Economy And Capitalism"*, Foot Note No. 1, p. 231.
14. COLE G. D. H. and Raymond POSTGATE *"The Common People"*—1746-1938, p. 433.
15. Ibid, p. 486.
16. Newell Leroy SIMS *"Society And Its Surplus"*, p. 247.

and dependencies so that she could extract concessions and privileges. In fact such concessions and privileges have always given rise to international envy and as such have been a potent cause of wars. This point will be discussed in detail a little later, however.

Simultaneously with the increasing foreign investments commodity exports also climbed. The recovery was slow. By 1900 exports reached the volume of £ 282 millions. This increase in exports was of course shared between the colonies and foreign countries. It is estimated that by 1906 exports had reached the figure of £ 375 millions. In 1910 the export figure recorded significant progress, it being £ 430 millions. No wonder that Wesley Michell remarks that "England was distinctly the most prosperous among the great nations of the world".[17] This constituted a very important factor in the prosperity enjoyed by the nation. Sir J. H. CLAPHAM makes a pertinent remark concerning the profitability of these exports. "Resources were turned towards foreign investment, rather than to the rebuilding of the dirty towns of Britain, simply because foreign investment seemed more remunerative".[18] He further remarks "that the roots of prosperity were overseas were fully recognized at the time".[19]

Such being the real position, Maurice DOBB is perfectly justified in asserting that "in England, there can be small doubt that it was the revival of capital export and the opportunities which the new Imperialism afford which was the essential factor in that new phase of prosperity between 1896 and 1914".[20] I would go even further than this and say that it was as a result of imperialist occupation of countries that the export of capital was facilitated and rendered so profitable. It is a welknown fact that England had spheres of economic influence over her colonies. Had it not been for railway building in India which began in the eighties of the last century England would not have been able to maintain a high level of exports of goods as well as a high level of exports of capital. Moreover the relations between England and India were of such a nature that she could extract all the benefits out of railway construction in India. Imperialist relation have always implied privileged position. The motive behind such exports and exports of capital has invariably been profit. J. A. HOBSON, classifying British foreign investment as of a mainly developmental nature observes that "the equipment of some large potentially productive area in Canada, Argentina or China, is probably the greatest service which British capital is capable of rendering, not merely to the country thus opened up, but to the world at large, and indirectly and in a particular degree to the industrial interests of Great Britain herself".[21] We cannot accept Hobson's description of the services rendered by her foreign investment to her industrial interests as indirect. And we do so especially because we have at our disposal good evidence to the contrary.

17. Wesley Michell as quoted Maurice DOBB in *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 316.
18. CLAPHAM J. H. *"An Economic History Of Modern Britain"*, *The Railway Age*. p. 53.
19. Ibid, p. 52.
20. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 313.
21. HOBSON J. A. *"An Economic Interpretation Of Investment"*, pp. 70-71.

HOBSON himself gives figures for "Income from Indian Colonial and foreign Government bonds and stocks, municipal stocks and railway securities" which give a lie to his opinion mentioned above. Below are given some of the figures :—

Years	Total
1886—87	44,508,002
1890—91	55,488,832
1896—97	56,318,967
1900—01	60,331,525
1905—06	73,899,265
1906—07	79,560,116[22]

Moreover as expressed by the same author "where the borrowing country does not rank on a political level with the creditor country, the more usual case, the investment bond commonly leads not to an alliance but to some closer political control".[23] History furnishes ample evidence of this. The position of India till late is a case in point. Capital is used for exploiting the debtor country.

Then again various other gains accrue due to imperialist relations. Chief among such advantages is employment afforded to her people. Thus in India British personnel has staffed various industrial concerns. So also British shipping service has always been preferred to foreign one. Even machinery and capital goods used in India were predominantly British. Besides England could dictate terms of trade to her colonies and dependencies so as to ensure cheap imports in relation to her exports. England has always (since the eighties of the last century) been an importer of food on a large scale. She could manage to maintain prices of food and such other materials she needed from her colonies and dependencies very low. The deliberate maintenance of the Sterling Rupee ratio at 1-6 in spite of a clamour of protests from the Indians is a case in point. Maurice DOBB acknowledges this fact while explaining as to why the British industrial worker could enjoy higher real wages inspite of the heavy depression. The British imports had always been valued lower than her exports even in the decade of the twenties of this century. "But now the ratio between the two was to undergo a further movement in our favour. Since Britain had maintained her traditional policy of free food imports, thus sharp turn in the terms of exchange between agriculture and industry was reflected in a fall in the cost of living, and hence a rise in real wages : a rise in real wages which since it arose from the external relations of the country, did not involve any rise in the wage cost of output to British industry".[24] The advantage alluded to earlier becomes all the more clear when we consider how the deficit between her imports and exports was wiped out by Britain. As a result of the investments made by her capitalists abroad, Britain gets interest. So also British shipping is used for carrying goods (both ways) by foreign countries. The payment for these services constitute Britain's "invisible exports". "In 1936 British net imports were valued at nearly £ 790,000,000 and British exports at just over £ 440,000,000. The difference was made up by the "invisible exports", without which it would be

22. Ibid, p. 65.
23. Ibid, p. 107.
24. Maurice DOBB *"Studies In The Development Of Capitalism"*, p. 335.

impossible to go on importing on anything like the same scale".[25]

And it is such gains which helps to explain the hold of imperialism on the mind of the people. This can be clearly evinced from the inability of the British Labour Party to implement her socialist programme in relation to the empire. Not only that the capitalists stand to gain but even the labourers gain, though of course at the cost of their brother labourers in the countries exploited. No wonder if Winston CHURCHILL remarked in 1930 that "the loss of India would mark and consummate the downfall of the British Empire........From such a catastrophe there would be no recovery".[26] Then again in 1931 CHURCHILL declared that "the loss of India would be final and fatal to us. It could not fail to be part of a process that would reduce us to the scale of a minor power".[27] These expressions go very well with his historical utterance during the last war, when referring to the proposal of granting independence to India he declared "I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire".[28] The empire is desired for its coveted profits.

The First World War was clearly an outcome of Imperialism. Germany wanted the much needed colonies. She wanted to reap profits out of colonies. The British empire led to envy. The high standard of living enjoyed by the British people was sufficient cause for envying her. The defeat of Germany in the first great war did not lead to the end of imperialism. And it was for none other reason than the desire on the part of the victors to seek more and more profit. Human wants in their nature are insatiable. German colonies were coolly divided among the victors.

The welknown paradox of capitalism viz "poverty amidst plenty" seeks to explain imperialistic policy. Profit being the motive force behind capitalistic production, investment is sought in fields where highest profits are available. But such fields cannot remain profitable for a long time as a result of competition. When investment in home markets is not profitable (highly) markets outside are sought. Not only that but an attempt is made to restrict the use of such markets. Otherwise competition by other countries is bound to bring down profits. LENIN observes that "the necessity for exporting capital arises from the fact that in a few countries capitalism has become "overripe".[29] His observation cannot be accepted fully. For capitalism can be said to be 'overripe' only when all the fields of investment at home are fully explored. But the common experience is that capital is exported and invested abroad even when there is sufficient opportunity for doing so at home. The primary consideration behind this is monopolistic profit which accrues from such investment. At home due to the working of competition sufficient profit cannot be forthcoming. Hence the desire to invest abroad. LENIN is perfectly justified in asserting that "imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism".[30]

25. COLE G. D. H. and Raymond POSTGATE *"The Common People"* 1746-1939, p. 598.
26. Louis FISCHER *"Empire"*, p. 52.
27. Ibid, p. 52.
28. Ibid, p. 36.
29. V. I. LENIN *"Imperialism" The Highest Stage Of Capitalism*, p. 58.
30. Ibid, p. 80.

It is a truism that under capitalist system of production competition brings profit to the minimum. Whatever the apologists of free competition may say about its beneficent nature viz it eliminates inefficiency, it cannot be denied that profits are brought to their minimum. In this world of ours activities are carried on for profits. The higher the profit, the better are such activities regarded. Maximisation of profit can be attained by curtailing, we may say wasteful competition. Monopoly reaps the highest gain. World of experience makes it clear that capitalism has reached the monopoly stage. It cannot be gainsaid that monopolistic elements are largely prevalent in the functioning of capitalism. If it were not for this it would have been possible to discard imperialism, when it has been intellectually discredited.

II

A general observation on the nature and the characteristics of the 'western civilization' will be very helpful in tackling the problem of social status and wealth. Behind all social activities a scale of social valuations is operating. Social values and attitudes play very important part in shaping social activities and events. It is much more so in a so-called rational society, where human activity could be planned, though of course to a limited extent. Indeed it has been most appropriately pointed out by E. H. CARR that one of the major pitfalls in the path of social investigator is the mixing up of purpose and analysis. This, he explains, is due to the inevitable fact that social facts are not independent of the attitudes of the people. To a large extent they are coloured by human attitudes.[31] He cites Karl Marx's instance. Marx's analysis of capitalism as a social system was largely influenced by his attitude towards it.

Going further than this I would say that human attitudes are guided by interests. This can be clearly discerned from the sway of imperialism on the British mind, to which a reference was made earlier. Ultimately our attitudes are greatly influenced by our interests. Thus our attitude towards capitalism is mainly the outcome of our interests. This fact is clearly revealed by the champions and apologists of capitalism.

Moreover these attitudes are translated into laws when quite a majority of people come to have the same attitude towards a particular problem. Modern society, being essentially legalistic, public approval of any action is sought in the shape of law. Over and above this modern society, being democratic, it becomes imperative to attain majority of people to support a particular line of action, if it is to attain the sanctity of law. Discussing the realist view of law E. H. CARR makes very pertinent observations on the nature of law. Thus he observes that law is primarily a command -(according to Hobbes' definition) and as such it is divorced from ethics. Considerations of morality do not affect the efficacy of law. The observance of law is ensured by the force of authority which backs it. Law is thus "an expression of the will of the state, and is used by those who control the state as an instrument of coercion against those who oppose their power".[32] Thus law is 'weapon of the stronger'. Even Rousseau, an ardent champion of law emphatically observes that

31. CARR E. H. *"The Twenty Years Crisis"* 1919-1939, pp. 6 and 7.
32. Ibid, p. 226.

"the spirit of the laws of all countries is always to favour the strong against the weak and him that has against him that has not".[33] Rousseau further regards this as the 'inevitable drawback' of law. No wonder if Marx described all law as the 'law of inequality'. What is represented by law is not the sense of ethics but the will of the dominant party which in itself is conditioned by its interests.

Law is the handmaid of politics, it is usually said. But it would be equally true to assert the converse in as much as political power is essential to enact laws. Hence we are confronted with Achille LORIA's famous thesis of connective institutions.[34] There is ample evidence in history to warrant this theory. This can be clearly evinced from the struggle to get the control of the state. For the present we defer the discussion of this point in detail to a later stage.

Human activities are so complex that legal enactment cannot compass the web of such actions and interactions. There are so many activities and attitudes which are beyond the pale of law. Thus the social status system of a modern society is no longer dependent on law or guided by it. It need not be emphasized that we give an entirely different connotation to the term status from that which is usual in connection with its feudal association. Associated with the feudal system status was legally and juristically fixed. In a modern society quite the contrary obtains. Present day society is essentially mobile and as such there can be no fixity of status. There is constant shifting. The status system can be clearly seen to be functioning in the modern social class system. Certain eminent authors like CARR-SAUNDERS raise an objection of very fundamental nature viz., that there are no social classes in a modern society. Here we shall see how the general culture obtaining in the present day is reflected in the views about social class system.

Modern society has reached the stage of monopoly capitalism. Monopoly rules supreme. And the fundamental characteristic of monopoly is that it vests power in the hands of a few. As a sequel to this power in the hands of a few, all activities are pursued in such a way as to enhance the power. Capitalist freedom is individualism par excellence. The cardinal principle of individualism is that everybody is free to better his lot. Success is the objective of individualism. Success usually means material success. Not that there are no other conceptions of success. But the most easily recognizable success has come to be purely material. Werner SOMBART most appropriately terms this age as the "Economic age", (in his book *"A New Social Philosophy"*). This is not to suggest that wealth was not valued in the bygone ages. But never before had it been valued as it is being done today. Today a man's position comes to be judged by the amount of wealth possessed by him. Even a cursory glance at any of the census figures will testify to this. Modern censuses classify people according to their incomes—higher income groups or lower income groups. Entire social setup is coloured by this view. Following Pitrim SOROKIN, we would call the modern culture as essentially 'sensate'. SOROKIN describes sensate mentality thus. "The sensate mentality, views reality as only that which is presented to the sense organs....... The sensate reality is thought of as a becoming process, change, flux, evolu-

33. Rousseau quoted by CARR E. H. *"The Twenty Years Crisis"*, p. 226.
34. LORIA A. *"Economic Foundations Of Society"*.

tion, progress, transformation. Its needs and aims are mainly physical, and maximum satisfaction is sought of these needs. The method of realizing them is not that of a modification within the human individuals composing the culture, but a modification or exploitation of the external world".[35]

On the contrary the society is infested with the acquisitive spirit. It is a proven fact that since the development of industrial capitalism religion ceased to have any hold on people's mind. The possibilities opened by industrialism made people confident of success. TAWNEY used a significant analogy when he describes the withdrawal of Church and state from the centre of social life as the removal of the "keystone holding together the social fabric".[36] This fact marks a significant change in the attitude of the people. Formerly rights were regarded as subordinate to some higher social purpose. But now rights and interests, were regarded as absolute, independent of any social purpose. The rising tide of individualism made the protection of such rights the supreme duty of the state and the society.

The right of property is one of the principal tenets of modern individualism. Those who possessed this right came to rule those who were devoid of it. Entire social fabric was affected. All the class relationships were determined by the most important right. Philosophically regarded, all this is a matter of valuation which society accepts. Whereas a man enters this world equipped with property rights, he is not entrusted with the fulfilment of service to society. His rights are regarded as independent of the services he may perform. It is quite convenient to assume that service will come in its wake when rights are given a free play. "But", as Tawney very trenchantly remarks, "it is not the primary motive and criterion of industry, but a secondary consequence, which emerges of rights".[37]

A review of modern history clearly shows that this conception is written large since the development of modern industrial capitalism. There is nothing to be wondered at the fact that economic rights remain irrespective of economic functions when we consider that those who uphold this view are at the helm of affairs. Moreover, capitalistic development having reached the monopolistic stage, such controlling power has come to be concentrated. The rivalry between land and industry has long since ended. Earlier we have seen how the alliance between landed gentry and industrialists meant concentration of power.

Modern economic theory has very correctly emphasised a principle of supreme sociological importance in regarding distribution as a special case of the theory of value. Thus "the theory of distribution is the theory which examines the causes determining the value of factors of production .... From this point of view it is an extension, rather, a consistent part of the theory of value".[38] Socially regarded, the price paid to various productive agents constitutes the social income. And "the determination of these prices is the determination of the shares of social income

35. Pitrim SOROKIN *"Social And Cultural Dynamics"*, Vol. I, p. 73.
36. TAWNEY R. H. *"The Acquisitive Society"*, p. 14.
37. Ibid, p. 23.
38. FRASER L. M. *"Economic Thought And Language"*, p. 344.

enjoyed by the various economic classes in the society".[39] The determiners of these shares are none other than those who have the economic power. The possessors of property have an ultimate say in determining the shares of various production agents. Little surprise need be felt if such determination is in their favour. Moreover accumulation of wealth is conditioned by opportunities. And opportunities are denied to those who are devoid of property. In short it tends to be a vicious circle, which it is difficult to break.

The prevalence of the class system can be felt in all the spheres of life. The essential prerequiste for the functioning of a class system is a mobile society, as we have noted earlier. The rise of individualism assured both social and economic mobility. And individualism was fostered by the development of trade and industry.

Discussion of the various theories of the concept of the social class has already brought home the point that many factors have to be taken into account in the explanation of the concept. We shall do so after we study the social classes and differences in income and the relationship between the two.

III

The social structure of any society is built up by the various classes of people. Amongst such classes we find the upper classes, the middle classes and the lower classes. We can as well divide population into urban and rural. So also can we divide the occupations followed by the people into the same category. As explicitly stated in the introductory chapter our study is primarily related to people who have earned incomes or to put it in a better way, working incomes.

We have noted how the industrial revolution wrought structural change in the body social and economic of the country. Here we are considering further developments. The industrial revolution gave impetus to industrialism and brought about the subordination of agriculture. Agriculture was distinctly relegated to a subordinate position. The same process continued unabated. The setting in of the depression in the seventies of the nineteenth century gave a very rude blow to English agriculture so much so that it could never recover. Industries also received a setback. But they could recover, the reasons of which have already been adumbrated earlier. Imperialist policy helped the recovery of industries. The balance which had long since tilted in favour of industries further did so. English agriculture no longer enjoyed natural protection. If we consider the employment figures the point will be brought home. Below are given figures about percentage of population employed in agricultural pursuits. In 1871 the percentage of the population engaged in agriculture was 16.8. It dwindled down to 13.8 in 1881. It was 11.6 in 1891 and only 9.5 in 1901. The significance of these can be properly uderstood only when we compare figures for other occupations. We not only study figures for industries but also those for professions, commerce, etc. In the context of these figures alone can the real position of agriculture be grasped.

39. KIERSTEAD B. S. "*Essentials Of Price Theory*", p. 166.

Summary Tables Of Occupations.
(England and Wales)

Class	1871	1881	1891	1901
Professional	684,102	647,075	926,132	972,685
Domestic	1633,514	1803,810	1900,328	1994,917
Commercial	815,424	980,128	1399,735	1858,454
Agricultural and fishing	1657,138	1383,184	1336,045	1152,495
Industrial	5137,725	6373,367	7336,344	8350,170[40]

These figures are eloquent enough not to need further comment. These figures become all the more significant in view of the fact that the agricultural population did not keep up in pace with an increase in the total population of the country. By 1911 things had come to such a pass that "only one occupied person in twelve got his or her living on the land, as compared with one in eight in 1881".[41]

This was of course due to multiplicity of factors for instance the area of arable land was reduced, mechanized agriculture relieving rural labour, etc. But the total result was disastrous to agriculture. By 1931 as large a percentage as 80 of the total population has been classed as urban, the rest being rural. In 1850 the percentage of population classed as urban was only 50.

This change in the proportion of people occupied in agriculture and industries had the inevitable consequence of belittling the agriculturist, bringing in its wake complex social consequences which we shall study presently.

The position of agricultural labourer can be properly gauged from his wages. In 1870-71 about 12s. per week; in 1880-81 he was getting about 14s. per week. Whereas ordinary labourers in chemical works got about 18s. per week. No wonder if a blacksmith was paid as much as 28s. per week in 1872 and 30s. per week in 1881. A millwright was given 30s. per week in 1872 and the same amount in 1881. A bricklayer got 22s. per week in 1871 and 26s. 6d. in 1882. Joiners received 28s. per week in 1871 and 29s. 6d. in 1882.[42]

The industrial revolution which was completed in England by the first quarter of the last century led to the increased use of machinery. As a natural consequence of this development the services of mechanics and engineers were needed. Thus their position improved. Naturally enough they were well paid. Engineer was paid about 38s. per week. Skill is recognised and accordingly paid higher.

Skilled trades got higher wages. Not only that such workers got relatively increased wages, but also absolutely increased wages as between 1886 and 1906. The table given below proves this point.

Earning in 1886 and 1906.

Industry	Average Earnings of males in full week (in shillings)	
	1886	1906
Coal Mining	21.2	31.5

40. All these figures are from HOBSON J. A. *"Evolution Of Modern Capitalism"*, pp. 384-385.
41. JONES and POOL *"A Hundred Years Of Economic Development"*, p. 220.
42. Sir Robert GIFFEN *"Economic Inquiries And Studies"*, Vol. I, p. 184.

Metals, engineering and shipbuilding	23.0	28.1
Textiles	19.4	22.9
Drink	23.0	25.0
Woodworking	21.4	27.1
Gas and Water	26.5	26.4
Railways	22.0	25.3
Agriculture	16.3	18.3[43]

Continuing the comparison we see that agricultural wages lag behind the industrial wages. In 1906 the wages of industrial worker and agricultural worker were 27.0s. per week and 18.3s. per week respectively. In 1924 the earnings of an industrial worker had increased to 57.6s. where as those of agricultural worker had increased to 31.5s. In 1921 the earnings of an industrial worker were 55.7s. and those of agricultural worker 35.0s. In 1935 an industrial worker received 56.9s. whereas an agricultural worker got 35.7s. per week.[44] These figures clearly bring out the growing power of industry.

The declining agricultural employment as a result of reduction in the area of arable land was compensated for by the new openings of employment afforded by industrial development. Many were absorbed in the textile industry. Railway absorbed some. Gardening and fruit growing gave employment. As a matter fact the tendency of concentration of holdings had long since disappeared.

G. D. H. Cole gives us figures of weekly earnings of men over 21 in various industries for october 1935. Below are given the figures :—

Paper, Printing and Book-Binding	83s.	8d.
Motor Engineering	78s.	5d.
Iron and Steel Manufacture	71s.	2d.
Transport and Storage	69s.	1d.
General Engineering	66s.	0d.
Woodworking	65s.	1d.
Clothing	64s.	4d.
Food, Drink and Tobacco	63s.	8d.
Building and Contracting	61s.	2d.
Public Utility Services	57s.	10d.
Woolen and Worsted	55s.	3d.
Cotton	49s.	9d.[45]

These figures bring out the working of another tendency that is attendant with modern development, namely the increasing importance attached to secondary industries. With the development of capitalist production a change is brought about in the nature of human wants. Wants become more and more secondary. The greater the preponderance of such wants the greater is said to be the degree of civilisation reached. Earlier we have noted the growth of employment of the professional class, the commercial class. In short employments which can be properly described under the heading services have been increasing very fast.

43. Jones and Pool *"A Hundred Years Of Economic Development"*, p. 267.
44. Ibid, p. 330.
45. Cole G. D. H. And Raymond Postgate: *"The British Common People"* 1746-1938 p. 619.

Quite a chain is intervening between the primary producer and the consumer.

Another notable tendency of late is the recognition of skill. This is clearly evinced by the fact that the linotype operator in London had a jobbing rate of 96s. per week. So also a skilled engineer in London got 68s. per week. A traindriver in London got between 71s. to 80s. per week. Even though these rates are exceptional the fact of differentiation between the skilled and unskilled remains. For labourers in Engineering trade in London got only 50s. 3d. per week.[46]

A study of the share of national income distributed amongst the various factors of production will clearly bring out the salient features of social valuation. By factors of production we mean all types of productive agents, personal services, etc. According to calculations made by Sir Chioza MONEY, before the first great war it was thought that about half the total national income was appropriated by only 12 per cent of the total population and that one third of the total income went to about 3 per cent of the population.[47] Later investigations have proved the inaccuracy of this estimate.

Professor A. L. BOWLEY has done a great service by making elaborate researches into the national income of England and its distribution. He has also made some investigations with the help of Sir Josiah STAMP. The results obtained by them are very valuable in analysing various social and economic problems. We have no hesitation in drawing on these results. In 1911 the occupied population of U.K. was estimated to have been 14,300,000. Below are given the numbers estimated to have been occupied under various categories. We are considering only men and boys. Thus wage earners numbered 11,000,000. Salaried persons were 1,120,000. Independent workers 650,000. Professionals 330,000. Farmers, etc., 580,000. Employers 620,000.

Shop assistants have been classed as wage earners. Teachers are classed as salaried. Nurses are regarded as 'Independent workers' or professionals. Hence no separate category is mentioned. Similarly farmers is a wide class comprising of small holders, market-gardeners and others who do not work for wages.[48]

In the productive industries the product is determined by the cooperation between manual and clerical labour, capital and proper direction. For they have to deal with competitive markets. Skilful management is necessitated. In such industries the share of the employers and shareholders is about 30 per cent of the net value of the product, about 9 per cent goes in salaries, and 56 per cent in wages, the remaining 5 per cent is taken usually by employers and independent workers.

Railways require a very large amount of capital. Naturally 52 per cent of the total income goes to the share and debenture holders, only 9 per cent in salaries, and the remaining 39 per cent in wages.

In the miscellaneous group of transport, commerce, shop-keeping, etc., the share of wages is 33 per cent of the total income, salaries 20 per

46. Ibid, p. 620.
47. These figures are taken from DALTON *"The Inequality Of Incomes"*, p. 4.
48. All this information is from Prof. A. L. BOWLEY *"The Division Of The Product Of Industry"*, p. 7.

cent, independent workers (small dealers and shop-keepers) get 18 per cent and 29 per cent goes to profit and interest.

In agriculture the share of wages is roughly 33 per cent of the total product.[49]

Considering all industries and occupations it is estimated that about 42 per cent went to wages, about 13 per cent went in small salaries (below £ 160) and to independent workers or small employers. Thus more than half the total income went to those earning below £ 160 per year.

In the study by the same author of the "*Changes in the distribution of Income*" 1880-1913 valuable information is available. The findings of the author's investigations are as follows. Though the proportion of the national income accruing to wages diminished from 41½ per cent to 35½ per cent, the receipt per wage-earner record an increase of more than 30 per cent. The proportion of income received by income tax payers (*i.e.* those with higher incomes) increased slightly. The share of the intermediate class increased.[50]

According to the author's estimate of the national income of U.K. in 1910 the share of various productive factors was as follows. Wages received 39 per cent. Intermediate income received 18 per cent. Income assessed to tax :—

£160-700	15 per cent.
£700-5000	22 per cent.
£5,000	8 per cent.[51]

A study of the share received by property and labour reveals that about 37½ per cent went to property holders and 62½ per cent to services and work.[52] ......

As a result of the first great war occupied population diminished. In 1911 the occupied population (men and boys) was 14,300,000 whereas in 1921 it was 13,656,000 (men and boys) of this population 10,526,000 were wage earners; salaried persons were, 1,637,000; Independent workers —841,000; Employers, farmers, professionals—652,000.[53]

In 1924 there was an increase in the proportion of income received by earned income. It was 78 per cent in 1924 whereas it was 75½ per cent in 1911. Unearned income diminished to 18½ per cent in 1924 from 23½ per cent in 1911. So also state pensions, etc., increased to 3½ per cent in 1924 from 1 per cent in 1911.[54]

It is estimated that in the thirties the wage bill tends to retain more or less same proportion. In 1911 it was 38½ per cent, 39½ per cent in 1924, 37 per cent in 1929 and 40½ per cent in 1931. Profits, interest rent, in short, income from property was estimated to have constituted 51 per cent of the national income in 1911, 40 per cent in 1929, and 36 per cent in 1931. On the other hand there has been a rise in the earnings of salaried persons. Thus in 1911 the share of salaried earnings is estimated to have been 10½ per cent, 20½ per cent in 1924, 21 per cent in 1929 and

49. Ibid, p. 24.
50. A. L. Bowley "*Changes In The Distribution Of Income*" 1880-1913, p. 21.
51. Ibid, p. 22.
52. Ibid, p. 24.
53. Bowley A. L. And Sir Josaih Stamp : "*The National Income*" 1924, p. 11.
54. Ibid, p. 52.

23½ per cent in 1931.[55] It is argued that the decline in the share of profits is illusory since salaries have increased.

But it is quite in the nature of things that salaries should be high. In fact that constitutes the main difference between wage-earners and salary-earners. This point will be amply proved when we compare the figures of income of salaries. Figures are quoted below which will bring out the growing importance of salary earners from the economic point of view :

Percentage Distribution Of Numbers Of Salaried Persons Classified By Amount Of Salaries Received In 1938.[56]

Male, 21 and Over (Percentages)

Range Of Annual Salaries	Private Industry: Manufacturing Industry	Distribution	Finance	Transport	Professions	Public Administration Local Authorities
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Upto £40	—	—	—	—	—	0.3
£40-59	0.1	0.1	—	0.1	—	0.3
£60-89	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.2	1.2	0.8
£90-125	3.2	8.5	2.4	1.3	7.5	3.1
£126-162	9.0	20.0	3.7	5.5	18.4	8.9
£163-250	33.1	30.5	11.7	29.5	34.5	34.5
Over £250	54.2	40.2	81.7	63.6	38.5	52.3

Now we proceed to study the earnings of shop assistants. A similarity can be discerned between the salary earners and shop assistants when we study the percentage of the range of earnings. Thus hardly 0.1 per cent get upto £ 40. So also 0.1 per cent get £ 40-59, 0.3 per cent get £ 60-89, 5.8 per cent get £ 90-125, 23.7 per cent get £ 126-162, 62.1 per cent get £ 163-250 and only 8.0 per cent get over £ 250.[57]

In the case of the shop-assistants we see that quite a large percentage is earned between the range of £ 163-250. But very little is earned over the range of £ 250. This study clearly brings out an important fact that from the income point of view they are inferior to the salaried persons.

A study of the wage-rates in various trades clearly shows that there is a certain maximum beyond which they do not earn. In factory trades the average annual wage of an operative was £ 117.5. In Building and Contracting trades the average yearly wage was £ 158 in the same year. And in coal mines the wage earned per year was £ 114 in 1930.[58]

A comparison of the earnings of the salaried persons, shop-assistants and wage-earners clearly proves that skill is valued highly, socially as

55. Cole G. D. H. And Raymond Postgate: *"The British Common People"* 1746-1939, p. 624.
56. We have reproduced part of Table III from *'National Income"* Edited by Bowley A. L., p. 89.
57. Ibid, Part of Table IV, p. 91.
58. Ibid, p. 155.

well as economically. Thus even amongst the salaried persons higher range of salary is earned in important offices like finance.

We should not be oblivious to the increased comforts and leisure afforded to the wage-earners when we compare their earnings. Hours of work have been reduced in most industries. In organized trades a week comprises of 48 hours. Besides so much public money is spent to ensure the welfare of wage-earners. It is long since the principle of *Laissez-faire* has been discarded. In the heyday of *laissez-faire*, (early nineteenth century) the state concerned itself only with the administration of poor law. There was no other social service. Not much progress had been made by 1890. This can be clearly seen from the figures of expenditure by the state on various services we quote below[59] :—

	1890 Million Pounds.	1933 Million Pounds.
Education	12	102.3
Hospitals, Mental Treatment And Maternity And Child Welfare	1.4	22.6
Housing	0.2	44.8
Poor Relief	9	46
Unemployment Insurance	None	101.5
Health Insurance	None	36
Contributory, Pensions For Widows, Orphans And The Aged	None	42
Old Age Pensions	None	41
War Pensions	None	43

These figures clearly bring to our notice that there has been considerable social awakening. No longer are the poor and the destitute left to themselves. The state and the society have undertaken to provide relief to the poor and downtrodden in the shape of various social services, which we have mentioned earlier. It is but natural on every body's part to have a keen desire to be esteemed high in the eyes of society. Our study bears out the fact that social esteem depends upon a complexity of factors like the occupation, wealth, skill, etc. But it is our common experience that very few individuals can attain social esteem. Are we to explain this sad spectacle in Darwinian terms? Certainly not. Social development has reached such a stage that we can no longer be oblivious of the working of social factors bringing about the present situation.

IV

Thus it is very pertinent to inquire into the complexity of social factors which are responsible in bringing about social and economic inequalities. We shall study this in brief only for a fuller discussion of the same will fit in better in the conclusion.

A refusal to explain the present inequalities social as well as economic in Darwinian terms does not mean that we are oblivious of the importance of heredity. Heredity, though a biological phenomenon primarily, has assumed immense social importance. Men are born with

59. These figures are from—J. Hampden JACKSON—*"England Since The Industrial Revolution"* 1815-1935, p. 289.

unequal capacities. The science of heredity tells us that the children of the prominent people stand better chances of having higher mental ability than those of ordinary people have. Thus it comes to social classes. The upper classes are more likely to have greater innate ability than that possessed by lower classes. Sir Francis Galton's study of genius has conclusively proved this. His study of the most prominent British scientists of the nineteenth century brings out the following result. Of the 107 scientists studied came from the nobility, 52 from liberal professions, 43 from bankers, big merchants and manufacturers, 2 from the class of farmers, and only 1 from the labour and artisan class.[60] More recent inquiry into the mental ability of the children of the persons of various classes lends support to the fact mentioned above. Thus messrs. CARR-SAUNDERS and Caradog JONES conducted an inquiry into the intelligence of children with reference to the occupations followed by their fathers for the country of Northumberland. The results of their inquiry are quoted below.[61]

Occupations Of Fathers	Average I.Q. Of Children.
Professional	112.2
Managerial	110.0
Higher Commercial	109.3
Army, Navy, Police and Postmen	105.5
Shopkeeping	105.0
Engineering	102.9
Foremen	102.7
Building	102.0
Metal Workers, Ship Builders	100.9
Miscellaneous Industrial Workers	100.6
Miners and Quarrymen	97.6
Agriculture (all classes)	97.6
Low Grade Occupations	96.0

Much depends on the innate qualities inherited. Yet such qualities can be developed only with proper amount of training and education. We need not be enmeshed in the controversy of "Nature versus Nurture". For as students of society we know that both are eqully important. Faculty has to be developed if it is to blossom.

Here comes in the factor of education and training. It is a welknown fact that higher occupations which are of course paid highly too, require a higher training and education. As a natural consequence higher occupations are usually recruited from the children of persons with higher occupations. Usually the poor are denied the facilities of higher education and training. Their scope is restricted.

All this hinges on the possession of property. In the present social set up the institution of private property has a considerable say in determining one's future. Actually it is the inheritance of private property which is crucial. It would certainly be wrong to argue that inheritance creates differences. But it accentuates inequalities of wealth and thus helps to perpetuate the advantages or the disadvantages. Investigations carried out by Josiah WEDGWOOD bear out the same conclusions.

60. Francis GALTON *"English Men Of Science"*, p. 16.
61. A. M. CARR-SAUNDERS and Caradog JONES *"Social Structure Of England And Wales"*, p. 216.

Mr. WEDGWOOD investigated in 1924 and 1926 the correlation between predecessors' and successors' estates. The following are the results of his inquiry. Of the men in the upper and the middle classes, "about one third owe their fortune almost entirely to inheritance, another one third to a combination of ability and luck with a considerable inheritance of wealth and business opportunity, and the remaining third largely to their own activities".[62]

It is an accepted fact that the institution of inheritance of property is injurious to social welfare. But the institution is completly legal. To change it, legal enactment is necessary. As it happens the legal machinery is controlled by the owners of property themselves. And it is a famous dictum that "it is no reproach to law to describe it as a bulwork of the existing order".[63] So how could they be expected to cut the ground under their own feet? Following facts will prove clearly how the state is dominated by property owners. They dominate the state by capturing seats in the Parliament. Both the houses of Parliament are dominated by them. Not for nothing is it said that sometimes facts are stranger than fiction. Thus aristocrats are not only members of the House of Lords, but they also sit in the Commons and are ministers in the Cabinet. In the Cabinet of December 1938, there were a Marquess, three Earls, two Viscounts, a Baron and a Baronet.[64]

Professor Laski's study gives additional evidence in support of this. Thus he shows that of 69 ministers who held office between 1885 and 1905, 40 were sons of nobility. Between 1917-24, even in the Labour Government there were 14 aristocrats out of 52 ministers.[65]

These wealthy aristocrats combined wealth with political power. They are also the ruling class. They devise subtle means to maintain their power and prestige. Thus they resort to granting of titles. A peep into the history of titles shows that originally they were granted for meritorious deeds. Wealth alone did not ensure title. But gradually wealth attained power enough to secure titles. Titles are nothing if not a measure of public estimation. That esteem still clings to titles even today. Titles during recent times have been a means of approval of wealth and bestowing honour on her possessors. Even Bagehot, who is reputed to be a consistant apologist of the rich and the powerful acclaims this when he says that "the office of an order of nobility is to impose on the common people".[66] Moreover most of the important titles are hereditary, resulting in a combination of wealth, political power and social approbation. ....

It is a common place of history that wealth, political power and social esteem come to be combined. The one leads to the other, if it is not already present. It is a sort of virtuous circle. Thus we get ample evidence to justify Loria's thesis of "connective institutions".

62. Josiah WEDGWOOD "*Economics Of Inheritance*", p. 179.
63. E. H. CARR "*Twenty Year's Crisis*", p. 244.
64. Simon HAXEY "*England's Money Lords*", Tory M.P.s., p. 118.
65. Ibid, p. 126.
66. Walter BAGEHOT "*The English Constitution*", p. 89.

CHAPTER IV

INDIA BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BRITISH RULE

Plan Of The Chapter :

(I) Introductory. Stating the period under review. Justification of selecting particular period.

(II) Organisational peculiarities and their economic and political repercussions.

(III) Social classes and differences in economic conditions with special reference to emoluments.

I

The study of English society has revealed clearly the necessity of a sort of an organic treatment of the problem. Thus we have studied English Society right from the feudal times. Our original task was limited to study the industrial capitalist system. It was, however, realized in time that any study of social system would not be realistic unless the forces which have shaped the system are properly considered. And past forces have also to be studied as they vitally shape present forces. To use a simile, we say that just as the blossoming of a tree is the result of the working of hidden processes, the forces which appear to shape society are themselves determined by forces and factors which may be extant. It is commonplace of history that capitalism has shaped the entire social structure in its peculiar way. But our study of English society has made it abundantly clear that the very development of capitalism was the result of many forces. Evolution is the primary characteristic of development of society. That is why we always find relics of the past in the present development. It has almost become proverbial to say that 'history is never made of a whole cloth'. Thus when we want to study social differentiation and differentiation in emoluments obtaining in India we should study from earlier times. The present state of society has been the result of many past forces. The peculiar nature of such forces will be studied a little later. The Indian social structure has been influenced vitally by the peculiarly varied nature of forces which were working. Hence we get a very mixed system. It is at once medieval and modern. As such it is of deep interest to us to study the Indian system. Our interest springs not from the mere fact that ours' is a society where capitalism has not been fully developed, but from the very working of various stages of development at the same time. Capitalist development has been attained in limited spheres only. Many spheres of activity have not been sufficiently influenced by the working of capitalism. The evils of the logical development of capitalist system are too welknown to need any repetition. And it is precisely the fact that our society has not been fully capitalist that gives us some reason for hope. It is possible to avoid the pitfalls inherent in capitalist development.

It may not be wrong to start our study of Indian society from the establishment of the British rule in India. But the question, namely when did the British rule commence in India from 1818 or from 1858,

immediately crops up. We know very well that the establishment of the British rule in India was a long drawn process. And it was the outcome of the week nature of the Indian state. Actually there was no homogeneity pertaining to the state. The Mughal Empire was only a name and not much of real power. There were many independent nobles who wielded complete autonomy over their territories. In the Deccan the Marathas never recognized the Mughal Rule to a sufficient degree to merit the use of the term empire. The emperor confirmed the Nizam "in the viceroyalty of the Deccan, with the title of Asaf Jah (June, 1725). This was the foundation of the present state of Hyderabad".[1] Subsequently the Nizam became independent. There was no such thing as centralized power and authority. The British who came as traders became conquerors and rulers. It was not till 1858 that the East India Company was divested of its power. The territories governed by the company became "part of the British possessions without any intermediary interest between the ruler and the people".[2] Thus it was from 1858 that a unified rule obtained over India.

The year 1858 is of immense political significance as far as the destiny of India is concerned. Yet it would be wrong to speak the same thing in connexion with the cultural position of India and its social structure. Culture and social structure obey no political laws. They have their own laws. A change in the political situation can be attained overnight. It takes years to bring about a vital change in the culture complex. The entire social set up and culture complex in India has been the outcome of various forces. The Muslim onslaught on India right from the tenth century A.D. has to be taken into account. Prior to the Muslim onslaught India was principally a Hindu nation. As such Indian culture was mainly influenced by Hindu social philosophy. Actually even after the establishment of Muslim rule over India, the Hindu philosophy of life held a considerable sway over the various institutions. The caste-system, the village panchayats, decentralization of authority, etc., are some of the most important features of Hindu social system. And these features continued to hold sway over the social relationships even after the establishment of Muslim rule.

India did not possess unity as a nation till Akbar's rule. Prior to that India was notoriously lacking in unity as a nation. It was Akbar who made successful attempt to achieve the fact of unity of India. Earlier Mughal rulers lacked in vision and broadmindedness. Akbar was shrewd and practical enough to realize that not much progress could be made without enlisting the active sympathy and co-operation on the part of the Hindu chiefs and people. The establishment of unity has been very correctly considered as the main contribution of Muslim rule in India.[3] And it was since the advent of Akbar that systematic attempts were made to bring about a fusion between the Hindus and the Muslims. Akbar's policy of appointing Hindus to responsible posts deserves special praise. It was this policy which helped in establishing unity. Prior to Akbar the Mughal court was composed entirely of Muslims and those too were foreigners. Akbar changed this state of affairs and effected unity by

1. *Cambridge History Of India Volume IV, "The Mughal Period"*, p. 377.
2. HAMILTON C. J. *"Trade Relations Between England And India"*, p. 230.
3. R. K. DAS *"India And A New Civilisation"*, p. 78.

appointing Hindus to higher positions.[4] The outcome of this policy is too welknown to need any comment.

Hence it is that we start our study of Indian society from Akbar's time. However, we should study the peculiar nature of Indian social organisation before tackling the problem proper of social differentiation and differentiation in economic emoluments. And this is in the fitness of things as the study of social organization throws floodlight on social evaluations.

II

A study of Indian social organization is predominantly a study of Hindu Social Organization. Hence no apology is tendered for treating, briefly though, right from the times of Aryan Civilization. In the present chapter we shall discuss the first two parts, the latter two parts will be discussed in the next chapter.

(1) The Aryans poured into India in the hoary past. It is very difficult to put a fixed date. "For the chronology of the Aryan conquests, which may well have extended over many generations or even centuries, we possess no certain dates".[5] It is certainly a commonplace that they were skilled in warfare and were very courageous. Their skill in warfare was of much avail to them in subjugating the primitive residents of India then. However, as they settled down they gave rise to the formation of small states comprising of various villages with a chieftain as their head.[6] They had also devised a kind of council of warriors. This was the natural outcome of their preoccupation with fighting the primitive people. They were conscious of their superiority and as such kept themselves above and aloof by restricting marriage to their own group. Nonetheless they allowed the male members to take wives from primitive tribes. "The broad distinction between conquerors and conquered, and the growth of social orders are indeed universal and inevitable".[7] Being very good organizers, the Aryans or rather the Indo-Aryans,[8] as rightly pointed out by GHURYE to differentiate the Aryans of India from those of Iran, evolved a scheme of functional division of society. Accordingly they divided themselves into three classes, the Brahmins to whom was assigned the duty of performing religious rituals and ceremonies, teaching, etc., the Rajanyas or the Kshatriyas to whom was assigned the duty of protecting and ruling, and the Vaisyas who were assigned common duties of producing food, trading, etc. This threefold division obtains in the Rigveda. The Shudras are not mentioned. For the Indo-Aryans then were not prepared to accept the Shudras in their fold as they were the Dasas or the Dasyus. This appears quite consistent with their desire to keep themselves above and aloof from the subjugated aborigines. The theory that the various classes came into existence as a result of being born of the various parts of the creator, the God, was certainly in keeping with the spirit of the times. A clear explanation of the position accorded to various classes is to be found in the theory. The specially high posi-

4. W. H. MORELAND *"India At The Death Of Akbar"*, pp. 69-70.
5. *Cambridge History Of India Volume I*, *"Ancient India"*, p. 23.
6. R. K. DAS *"Indian And A New Civilization"*, pp. 3-4.
7. *Cambridge History Of India Volume I*, *"Ancient India"*, p. 54.
8. G. S. GHURYE *"Caste And Race In India"*, p. 112.

tion accorded to the Brahmin class can be very easily explained in terms of the stage of civilization then reached. We know very well that in those days the forces of nature were entirely beyond human control. Freaks and fancies of nature were explained as the desire of the almighty God. Naturally enough those who could put the people in communion with the God through the operation of various rituals and sacrifices came to be very highly respected. Even the King, who belonged to the Kshatriya class, was ordained to hold the Brahmins in highest esteem.

In the wake of functional division came occupational division. This was certainly the logical development of the original division of society into four classes. We purposely say four classes for the threefold division in the Rigveda always assumed the fourth class of the Sudras, which was according to the conception then not worth mentioning. Nonetheless the Sudras or the Dasas or the Dasyus did comprise the fourth class. GHURYE rightly observes that "with functional differentiation in society there came into being separate occupational groups with more or less distinct interests".[9] Theories about natural inclination of various classes for particular occupation were propounded to justify the assignment of particular work to particular class. Occupations came to be decided by heredity. This was the natural outcome of the desire to maintain the purity of the race on the part of the higher orders and particularly of the Brahmin class. Being obsessed with the desire of guaranteeing the purity of rituals, the Brahmin class ordained that particular occupations should be taken up by particular classes. As a sequel to this occupational groups came to be endogamous. The natural functional division of labour thus assumed the rigidity of caste. The caste-system embodies various elements arising out of a multiplicity of causes, namely racial, political, social, functional and occupational. The caste-system covers almost all the sectors of social activity. And thus it figures most prominently in the Hindu social organization.

Likewise their family system plays an important role. The Aryans who came to India were certain families. They were patronymic.[10] The father of the family was the most important person. Nonetheless women were well respected. The origin of the Hindu Joint Family System is to be traced to the Aryans who came to India in groups. Their group solidarity developed into the joint family system. The characteristic of Hindu social organization is that considerable importance is attached to the family. Even Budhism could not belittle the importance of family. The Kshatriyas, who were the foremost followers of Budhism took great pride in their ancestors. The Rajputs, who subsequently represented the Kshatriya class indulged in ancestor worship. The debt owed by one to one's family for upbringing and development is translated into the feeling of reverence for the ancestors. The family system remained unchanged even after the Muslim rule, as we shall see presently.

Just as the caste-system was a crucial contribution by the Vedic civilization to Hindu social organization, the village-system of the Vedic period has become a major feature of Hindu social organization. The democratic nature of village administration in the Vedic period can be said to have laid the foundation of the republics which were to flourish

9. Ibid, p. 146.
10. R. K. DAS *"India And A New Civilisation"*, p. 37.

later. In the Vedic period the governing of village was in the hands of Samiti or Assembly, which was essentially representative. The representatives of various villages were authorized to appoint the Sabha or the standing committee the Vidatha or religious council, the Sena or the army, and the Charana or the educational faculty. Public works were undertaken by the villages.[11] The activities undertaken by the village system were of an all pervasive nature. No sector of social life was left uncared for. The system of village panchayats, in which the power of awarding justice was vested, emanated from the village system. Actually the village panchayats came to become as good as government. And as we know well, the village panchayats dominated the social life even in modern times until their decline arising out of the British Rule.

The caste system was carried to its logical extreme by the Brahmins in their zeal to maintain purity of race and religious rituals. Their observation of endogamy, looking down—on other castes enraged the other castes and particularly the Kshatriyas. The "Parsuram Myth" brings out clearly the feeling of superiority on the part of the Brahmins. As pertinently pointed out by Ghurye,[12]—Budhism was the natural reaction of the Kshatriyas against Brahmin domination. Budhism only set the ball rolling. Brahmin domination had been the subject of wrath to other castes. The spread of Budhism and Jainism put a stop to the unchallenged supremacy of the Brahmins. These sects advocated the theory that all castes are alike and that birth alone does not determine a person's status. Moreover Budhism emphasized the importance of the introduction of charitable aspects of life such as the aversion to shedding blood and war, building hospitals and rest houses, kindly treatment to animals, etc.[13] On these counts Budhism gained favour of the people and spread very wide.

Yet the growing power of Hinduism, as the result of Sankara's staunch advocacy coupled with the fact that Budhism entailed very austere living on its adherents, was one of the reasons of the decline of Budhism. In the meanwhile the Kshatriyas who were the most prominent followers of Budhism gave up their primary occupation of fighting. And an altogether new class of people came up as a result of the intermixture of the Kshatriyas with Aryanised Sudras and the descendants of the Huns and other central asian tribes which raided India constantly. And that class is known as the Rajputs.[14] The very name is suggestive of their power. Under Rajput rule India enjoyed the 'golden age of the new culture'.

The conflict between the various castes had more or less been resolved by then. There was a tacit recognition of the position occupied by the various castes. Thus the divinity of the Brahmin by birth was recognized. Yet various occupations were open to the Brahmins, some of them actually holding high posts in the state. The king's position as semi-divine was duly recognized. Various vocations and industries flourished as a result of peace and tranquility.[15]

11. Ibid, p. 39.
12. G. S. Ghurye *"Caste And Race In India"*, p. 67.
13. R. K. Das *"India And A New Civilisation"*, p. 9.
14. Ibid, p. 14.
15. Ibid, p. 15.

The significant outcome was that the caste system, though an accepted fact, did not necessarily mean the original occupational differentiation. Everybody was free to take up any profession. Nonetheless the social differentiation with its attendant hierarchy continued to obtain.

The functions undertaken by the state then testify to the advance recorded in the development of social organization. Administration of minute activities such as registration of births and deaths, issuing passports to strangers bear ample testimony of the advance made. The regulation of prices, weights and measures, advances made in architectural arts, ship-building, etc., adduce considerable proof of the same.[16]

(2) The Muslims started raiding India from the tenth century A.D. Yet it was not till the thirteenth century that Muslim rule was established in the upper parts of India. Actually we must distinguish between the earlier and the later Muslim rule. The Afghans who raided the country earlier just came to plunder and for looting. They never settled in the real sense of the term. The Mughals, who raided India in the sixteenth century, did so with a view to settle themselves in India. Afghans were just marauders. Their civil rule was not at all different from military rule. They indulged in the massacre of infidels and took delight in the demolition of Hindu temples and shrines. The breaking of Idols of Somnath by Mahmud of Ghazni is a case in point. Their rule was far from peaceful and in no way beneficial from the point of view of development. The main repercussion of their rule on Hindu social organization was the tightening of the caste system. The attempt on the part of the afghans to convert Hindu population naturally made for conservatism on the part of Hindus. "Hinduism in self-defense against the intrusion of Islam, shrank into its shell using its characteristic weapon of of self defense, passive resistance. Its social structure was preserved but remained in a state of arrested development. The fetters of caste were tightened, the domination of Brahmins becoming more pronounced with the disappearance of Hindu sovereigns, whose power to raise and lower castes in the social scale had helped to prevent the barriers between them being immutably fixed."[17] This trenchant observation aptly sums up the effects of the earlier Muslim rule. Under the conditions not much of give and take could be possible between the two communities.

But with the advent of Mughal rule things took a turn for the better. The Mughals were a settling sort. For settlement peace is essential. And peaceful conditions give rise to amity. More and more contact became possible between the Hindus and the Muslims. As we know, the Muslims were quite a minority then. They had a real desire to settle here. Hence more and more co-operation with the Hindus was rendered feasible. Already there had been an exchange of "intellectual impulses, and there was a synthesis of culture to which the Muslims made contributions of substantial value."[18] Akbar was very shrewd and practical. He clearly realized the importance of enlisting active Hindu co-operation. His wise policy of appointing deserving Hindus to responsible positions bore rich fruit. A sense of unity, unique in the history of India, came

16. Ibid, pp. 41-44.
17. O'Mally *"Modern India And The West"*, p. 7.
18. Ibid, p. 8.

as the result of Akbar's policy. It is certainly an accepted fact that the Mughal administration brought the sense of unity to India.[19]

Moreover the Muslims adopted certain Hindu institutions such as those based on differences of occupations and trades. How close the co-operation between the Hindus and the Muslims in administration as well as in civil life was can be discerned from the fact that a common language, Urdu, which was Hindi in grammar but mainly used Persian alphabet, was evolved. The liking taken for Hindu cultural activities such as songs by Akbar and Jehangir adduces further proof of the same.[20]

Muslim administration left untouched the village system which was prevalent. The state concerned itself only with the collection of revenue. Though their revenue system was irksome, village system was otherwise unaffected. Successors of Akbar were not so considerate in their policy. They discriminated between the Muslims and the Hindus. The imposition of the Jiziyat by Aurangzeb is a case in point.

Despite the functioning of Mughal Empire as such, there were many autonomous units which were not swayed over by the Mughal rule. There were Maratha states and Muslim confederacies in the Deccan and Hindu states in the south. Yet if we consider these states from the view-point of the revenue system, it must be admitted that it was equally irksome.

The social structure during the Mughal rule was characteristically pyramidal in shape. The nobles were at the top, the common people, peasants and artisans constituting the bottom. There was opulence at the one end and grinding poverty and misery at the other. There was no such thing as a powerful middle class. Nobility was not hereditary but personal. Anybody could be impoverished by the practice of confiscation of property. Fortune was freakish and not assured. This no doubt had a levelling effect.[21]

The unwise policy of oppressing the Hindus followed by successors of Akbar hastened the downfall of the Mughal Empire. After Aurangzeb's death anarchy ruled supreme. Yet there was no power which could effectively substitute the Mughal Empire and wield central authority. The Marathas were powerless to do so. So also were the Sikhs. The Hindus could never present a united front and thus could not establish an empire. The disintegration of the Mughal Empire created a void. The British infiltration, which went on for a long time tried to fill that void. This, however, we shall discuss in the next chapter.

Now we shall study the economic and political effects of Muslim rule on the entire social structure. Study of social structure reveals clearly the various aspects of society viz the social, the political and the economic. It facilitates the construction of a coherent picture of the functioning of various processes in society. It is against the background of such a picture that we shall study the problem proper. The various ramifications of the problem unfold themselves during the course.

19. R. K. Das *"India And A New Civilisation'*, p. 78.
20. O'Mally *"Modern India And The West"*, p. 9.
21. Ibid, pp. 17-19.

III

A word of caution is necessary before we embark on our study of the economic and political effects of the Muslim rule on Indian social structure. In such studies where one has to evaluate and criticize upon the merits and defects of a particular rule or system, one is influenced by one's attitude and point of view. Thus our evaluation is determined by the criteria we hold. The advance of social philosophy affects our criteria. We no longer hold the criteria held by people in the past. To be concrete, when we examine any system or rule we have in mind the criterion of the greatest good of the largest number. Accordingly we examine the system with this criterion in view. In fact our very ideas about merits and defects are determined by the criteria held. For instance the grandeur of palaces during the Muslim rule was praised by many historians. But we do not stop just at that. We proceed to study the condition of the common man. That is why we are not carried away by the description of the Mughal palaces. Grandeur which is not consistent with the wellbeing of the totality of a people does not appeal to our sense of justice.

Our study starts from the Mughal Rule. Then we study the effects of the interlude of Maratha Rule.

Earlier we have noted how it was from Akbar's reign that centralized rule obtained over India. So also we have seen that the village system was left untouched except for administering land revenue. This administration had, however, considerable influence over the whole system of production, distribution and the general welbeing of the population. Land revenue was the main source of income to the state where-from the expenditure on administration of the state was met. In fact as Moreland observes "under the Moghuls administration meant primarily the collection of the land revenue".[22] Moreover it was the ideal of Emperor Akbar to collect the land revenue directly from the cultivators of the soil. This ideal was not, however, always realized in practice. In many places there were the "zamindars" who collected the revenue. No definite meaning is attached to the term "zamindar". The term only means that he was an intermediary between the peasant and the Emperor. A "zamindar" was not necessarily a chief or a prince. He was not a grantee or an official of the state.[23] Akbar was essentially practical. And hence he did not adopt a uniform revenue policy. Allowances for local variations in the yield and the capacity to pay were made. However, usually the revenue demand amounted to one-third of the gross produce. According to Hindu ideals the revenue should have been one-sixth or one-twelfth.[24] Anyway Akbar's demand was quite reasonable when compared to that made by Alla-uddin Khilji, who demanded one-half. After Akbar's death the share of the revenue was increased to one-half. It naturally resulted in the impoverishment of the peasant. Very little was left to the peasant after paying fifty percent of the gross produce. The remainder was hardly sufficient to satisfy day to day wants. No wonder that in the event of an unforeseen calamity like failure of rain or famine the pea-

22. W. H. MORELAND *"India At The Death Of Akbar"*, p. 3.
23. Ibid, p. 3.
24. O'MALLY *"Modern India And The West"*, p. 13.

sant had nothing to draw upon. This state of affairs adequately explains the severity of famine. Under Jehangir's and Shah Jehan's rules the proportion of land revenue was stipulated at fifty per cent. But during Aurangzeb's rule it was some times increased to seventy-five per cent, resulting in untold sufferings of the peasants. The description of the famine in 1670 by the Dutch traveller van Graff, as reproduced by O'Mally, aptly reveals the state of affairs. The description runs. "We saw nothing but poverty and misery among the country folk. Scarcity and famine were greater than had ever been known within the memory of a man. The cause was the failure of the rice crop and the inundations of the Ganges. The people died in heaps........Slaves could be bought for next to nothing".[25]

No wonder that slavery flourished. Slaves were available in plenty. They could be purchased at next to nothing. This clearly brings out the utter lack of surplus with the masses and the absence of sympathetic administration. No doubt that attempts were made by Shah Jehan and Aurangzeb to alleviate the sufferings in the shape of abolition of certain taxes and dues and by opening free kitchens. But such efforts were nothing as compared to the magnitude of the problem.

The administrative system had thus far reaching effects on the condition of the people at large. The revenue system left so little to the producer that there was no incentive to produce more. Moreover the lack of capital did not allow peasants to reap profits even when there were opportunities of doing so. The peasants were forced to sell their produce immediately after the harvest, when the prices are lowest. The zamindars who were responsible for the collection of revenue extracted considerable sums from the peasants. The oppression and tyranny of the peasants had gone to such length that as aptly described by Bernier, "Even a considerable proportion of the good land remains untilled for want of labourers. Many of the peasantry, driven to despair by execrable tyranny, abandon the country, and seek a more tolerable mode of existence either in the towns or the camps".[26]

Not only that the administrative system did not encourage higher production but it positively discouraged higher production. It was the usual practice to confiscate property and wealth of rich merchants as well as peasants. Sir Thomas Roe remarks that the "Moghul was the heir of all his subjects". Whether or not we accept this general remark, it must be accepted that the "Emperor certainly claimed the goods left by the wealtheir merchants as well as by his nobles and officers".[27] This policy certainly had very adverse effects on production and industry.

Defence was a vital problem of administration as there was a constant menace of foreign invasions and depradations. Hence Akbar instituted the system of granting jagir to those who could supply troops. The grant of jagir was not hereditary but personal. The retainment of jagir was determined by the Emperor's sweet will. High position or nobility was thus personal and not hereditary. Posts were not obtained only by high birth. Men obtained nobility by receiving military or civil appointments, and such appointments were not hereditary. The

25. Ibid, p. 13.
26. MORELAND W. H. *"From Akbar To Aurangzeb"*, p. 202.
27. MORELAND W. H. *"India At The Death Of Akbar"*, p. 51.

assignment of jagir was conditioned by the ability to supply sufficient troops. Grants tended to be hereditary when this liability was passed from father of son. However, there was no rule to the effect. On the contrary in case of death even the private property of the 'official aristocracy' could be escheated. Aurangzeb recorded his protest against this system in a letter to his father Shah Jehan—"It is your wish that I should adhere rigidly to the old custom and declare myself heir to every person who dies in my service. We have been accustomed, as soon as a noble or rich merchant has ceased to breathe, nay sometimes before the vital spark has fled, to place seals on his coffers, to imprison and beat the servants or officers of his household until they make a full disclosure of the whole property, even of the most inconsiderable jewel; but can we deny its injustice and cruelty".[28]

Under such circumstances accumulation of large capital was not possible. And accumulation of vast capital is very essential to carry on trade and industry on a capitalistic basis. Industrial production was carried on mostly by individuals. Yet of course there were middlemen. In spite of these difficulties the volume of Indian trade was quite big. Industrial development had reached a respectable standard. There was a considerable variety of arts and manufactures which was in heavy demand from foreign countries. Organisation of production as well as the financial administration of such production was distinctly of high order. Indian muslin and calicoes were exported to European countries in large quantities. Actually "it was the lure of trade profits which attracted the English first to the Indian Archipelago and the Coromandel Coast in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, and in the next quarter to Bengal".[29] India had a shipbuilding industry too to provide the ocean-going vessels for purposes of trade. No better testimony can be produced in support of the view expressed above than the one expressed by MORELAND, who is very reluctant to admit of India's better position then. Grudgingly though, he writes "it is still to my mind indisputable that in the matter of industry India was more advanced relatively to Western Europe than she is to-day".[30]

The brisk Indian trade was adversely affected by European piracy. As the European merchants settled in India, they came to wield monopolistic control over production. The artisans, who were poor, were given advances by European merchants. Accordingly the artisans had perforce to sell their products to these merchants. This harmful practice of *dadani*—advance instituted during the mogul rule was adroitly exploited by European merchants and especially so by the English merchants. Production was thus controlled by them. Poor artisans became a plaything in the hands of the merchants. This fact explains why very little was left to the producers. The producers were impoverished.

The absence of the middle class during Mogul rule which has become proverbial seems to me to be the main cause of the impoverishment of the producers arising out of theirs being at the mercy of foreign merchants. During the Mogul rule there were nobles and chiefs at the top and peasants and producers at the bottom. As Bernier puts it. "In

28. O'MALLY *"Modern India And The West"*, p. 17.
29. Radhakamal MUKERJEE *"The Economic History Of India"* 1600-1800, p. 102.
30. MORELAND W. H. *"India At The Death Of Akbar"*, pp. 155-56.

Delhi there is no middle state. A man must be either of the highest rank or live miserably".[31] Moreover we know that the people at the top were mainly engaged in pursuits of an unproductive nature. The building of luxurious palaces, though it offered employment to architects and masons, etc., was not of much productive value. The masses were sunk in poverty mainly as a result of the revenue policy and the dadani or the advance system. The rich few lived a luxurious life at the cost of the sweated labour of the poor. The middle class which could have successfully bridged the gap and financed and executed productive pursuits, was a crying need of the times. It was precisely the absence of such effective middle class which gave opportunity to European merchants to assume control over production and trade. This marks the beginning of the drama of exploitation which was to develop in times to come.

The social structure was thus not stable during the Mogul rule. Too many at the bottom and too few at the top, who did not effectively contribute to production makes the structure unwieldy. Even a minor shock could have toppled the structure. No wonder then that in the face of many forces such as the growth of anarchy after Aurangzeb's death, growing control of the English, opposition by the marathas in the Deccan, invasions by foreign powers such as the invasion of Nadir Shah, etc., led to the disruption of the structure. The base itself was not firmly founded. And the super-structure was very flimsy and could not withstand the shocks given by powerful forces. The whole position has been admirably epitomised by Sir Thomas Roe. Describing how the people of India lived then, Sir Thomas Roe says that they "live as fishes do in the sea, the great ones eat up the little. For first the farmer robs the peasant, the gentleman robs the farmer, the greater robs the lesser, and the King robs all".[32] In fine the whole system, was unbalanced. We must accept Moreland's indictment on mogul rule at the end of the sixteenth century. He writes that "the economic life at the end of the sixteenth century was characterized essentially by inadequate production and faulty distribution".[33] This Characterization holds all the more truer of later times and especially so after Aurangzeb's death when the mogul empire became ramshackled and finally disintegrated.

Akbar's policy of religious toleration secured for him the active co-operation of the Hindu. His successors were not wise or practical enough to continue the same policy. Shah Jehan, his grandson, demolished Hindu temples. However, he was no persecutor. But Aurangzeb being a zealous Suni, lost sense of proportion. With Aurangzeb bigotory outran discretion so much so that the ruling activities came to be subordinated. Hindu officers were thrown out of offices. Jiziyat was imposed on the Hindus. Discriminatory treatment as regards matters of trade was given to Hindu merchants. Orders were given for demolition of temple, new as well as old. Religious fairs were prohibited. All these measures very naturally infuriated the Hindus. It was mainly due to this suicidal policy that "national movements sprang up among the Marathas and Sikhs, which brought down the mogul empire in ruins".[34]

31. Ibid, p. 26.
32. Ibid, p. 269.
33. Ibid, p. 299.
34. O'MALLY *"Modern India And The West"*, p. 22.

After Aurangzeb's death anarchy ensued as there was no effective power to replace it. In 1739 Nadir Shah captured Delhi and massacred and looted the capital. Then there were repeated Afghan invasions. Inland territories were looted by the Marathas. Now we come to the interlude of the Maratha Rule. Very little can be said about the constructive side of the Maratha Rule. The Marathas, though they were Hindus, did not spare anybody in their pillaging. Even Hindu temples were demolished by them. Only those who could give money as demanded were let free. Those who failed to do so had their nose or head or hands cut off. Some were even strangled to death.[35] The only saving grace about these invasions was that they were periodic and not continual. Only in the dry seasons would such invasions be carried out. These invasions damaged the crops and devastated territory. Productive activity came to a standstill. ....

After the death of Madhavrao Peshwa there was nobody who could wield control over Maratha princes. Holkar of Indore, Scindia of Gwalior, Gaekewar of Baroda, Bhonsle of Nagpur all assumed entire control of territories. Nominally only they owed allegiance to the Peshwa. There was no such thing as Maratha Empire. For powerful though by themselves, the above mentioned princes ceased to be a national force. Their army was not used for national purposes but for their own purposes.

The marathas were mainly a fighting people. They possessed considerable acumen for predatory warfare. But the same cannot be said about their administrative ability. They concerned themselves only with the raiding of villages. Erection of public utility works such as roads, waterworks, sarais, etc., were left uncared for. The source of revenue was primarily predatory warfare. It was certainly a vicious practice to raise finance out of pillage and arson. We cannot accuse the European officer in Peshwas service in 1796 of partiality, when he says that the empire always considered itself in a state of war.[36] Sir Thomas Roe condems the maratha government as the most destructive. He further adds that all other Hindu states undertook constructive activities such as the building of canals, temples, reservoirs, etc. The marathas, however, never did anything of the kind.[37]

The financing of such wars was met out of oppressing the peasants, merchants and whosoever were rich. In the occurrence of famine the condition of the general population was precarious. Instances are available in plenty where towns and places were desolate. In 1785 Sir Charles Malet found that the country near Gwalior was depopulated. The plundering of towns worsened the position of the dwellers. Raghoba has been very notorious in this connection. He is reported to have demanded a payment of Rs. 60,000, from Nariad, in the Kaira district of Bombay, on a threat of pillage, even though the same town had been plundered twice within a short period of three months.

The panchayat system of the marathas provided the silver lining to the dark cloudy atmosphere. The panchayats were more of courts of arbitration rather than ordinary courts. For always an attempt was made to bring about amicable settlement of disputes. The functioning

35. Jadunath SARKAR *"Fall Of The Mogul Empire"*, Vol. I, pp. 86-88-101.
36. O'MALLY *"Modern India And The West"*, p. 27.
37. Ibid, p. 27.

of village communities, little republics was another good feature of the maratha rule. Later on the disintegration of the village communities completed the gloomy picture sketched above. Needless to say that there was no incentive to production. Distribution was very faulty. There was no such thing as the stability of social structure. The only class of people who were prosperous were the princes and the chiefs. The general population was economically backward. Many were the inroads made by the British into urban industries arising out of their policy. We shall study this later on. In short economically, politically and socially the condition of the people was far from happy. The growing poverty was telling on the population.

IV

Earlier we have noted how the Mughal social structure was pyramidal. The nobles were at the top, there was spurious middle class. And at the bottom were the common people and slaves. Now we study these classes in details considering the social position accorded to them, and their income.

After a careful study of the method of classifying the population adopted by MORELAND, we are convinced of the usefulness and the propriety of his method and we follow the same method accordingly. He divides the population into two groups "the first of which is of interest mainly from the point of view of consumption, while the second comprises the classes whose principal importance is found in production".[38] We are inclined to adopt this primary grouping for it conforms largely to the prevailing conditions then. We know that quite a large amount of national energy was spent on producing luxuries while the common people lived on a starvation level. Productive activity was discouraged as a result of the administrative policy adopted by the state. Accumulation of capital was discouraged and expenditure on luxuries was promoted. A class of producers which catered to the demands of the nobles and the upper class was distinct from the class of producers which supplied ordinary day-to-day needs. Thus having divided the population into two primary groups relating to consumption and production we subdivide the two groups. The first group divided into, (a) The court and the Imperial Service, (b) the professionals, and (c) domestic servants and slaves. The second group is divided into classes engaged in agriculture, and industry. The division of the second group does not mean that there was a clear-cut distinction observed between the two types of workers. For we know that peasants engaged themselves in the production of handicrafts. Agricultural and industrial production was in many cases fruitfully combined. The division is only for convenience' sake.

We are fully aware that by adopting the above mentioned classification we are violating the traditional classification viz. the upper, the middle and the lower classes. But of what avail is traditional classification when we know for certain that the actual conditions did not approximate to the simple model constructed by traditional classification? We know that there was not much of a middle class. Moreover we know that the very system of production was classified on the basis of the

38. MORELAND W. H. "*India At The Death Of Akbar*", p. 27.

needs it supplied. Only those producers who supplied the demand of the nobles which comprised mainly of luxuries were valued. Then again there was not much scope for learned men, who could have effectively comprised the middle class. The entire productive system was controlled by the nobles. Free production in the modern sense of the term was conspicuous by absence. We shall later on see how even the so-called free labourers were free in name only. Further we know that the very existence of the upper class was on a somewhat precarious footing inasmuch as it depended on the whim and fancy of the Emperor. The study of English feudal system reveals the contrast between the position of the feudal lords and moghul nobles. For in the case of the former the position and wealth enjoyed was hereditary while in the latter case it was not so. The system of escheating property on the death of a noble, adopted by the Mughals made the position very uncertain and thus precarious. There was no security of property. The peculiar administrative system did not permit one's living on accumulated capital. For it was not possible then for one to remain rich when others were aware of his wealth. Wealth would be confiscated for no reason. The whole system was capricious. As such we cannot adopt the traditional classification.

Under the first group the Consumers' Group we have included, (a) the court and the Imperial Service, (b) the professionals, and (c) domestic servants and slaves. A brief resume of the administration will not be out of place prior to the discussion of the position of those in charge of administration. Administration of a country is always determined by the 'objects in view' since it is the duty of the state to make organized efforts to fulfil those objects. In the India of Akbar's time the entire administration was coloured by the objects in view namely the collection of revenue and raising of *militia*. And it was the usual practice of combining both the functions in the same officer. Nevertheless the state territory was divided into provinces, or districts. Two types of appointment were held—one the Kachha and the other Pakka. Those who held Kachha appointment were paid a fixed salary while those who held Pakka appointments were entitled to retain the excess of the amount of revenue collected after having paid a fixed sum to the state. This system marks the beginning of the Jagir system. This system prevailed also in the kingdom of Vijaynagar and in the Deccan territories. Akbar was not personally inclined to favour this system. He tried to separate the post of a military commander from that of a revenue officer. But in practice this ideal could not be sufficiently realized.[39]

The very fact that the Imperial and the court service were not distinguished from each other proves our point. (a) Now as to Imperial and Court Service, no distinction was made between courtiers and officials. The whole position was like this. Men came to Court in search of a career. In the event of success they achieved military rank, administrative duties and remuneration. If unsuccessful they withdrew. The remuneration was sometimes given in the form of a cash salary or sometimes in the grant of the whole or a portion of the revenue yielded by the particular area. Independent aristocracy did not obtain, for independence meant rebellion. A noble had to be subservient to the emperor. The

39. Ibid, pp. 32-34.

system prevailing in the Mughal Empire was not different from that prevailing in the Kingdom of Vijaynagar. Similar system obtained in the Deccan also.

But Akbar tried to perfect the system inasmuch as all the great men of the Empire were properly graded in the service. All those who were in the Imperial Service were appointed to a rank (mansab) as in charge of cavalry. In the middle of Akbar's reign the highest rank an ordinary man could get was that of the commander of 5,000. Only princes could get higher rank than this. Thus Prince Salim, afterwards Jehangir, was the commander of 10,000. Various gradations were made. Persons in command of 400 were known as man-sabdar. Those who were in command from 500 to 2,500 were known as Amirs, and from 3,000 upwards as Amir-I-Azam or Umda. These commanders had to maintain the above mentioned troops. They were given more or less fixed salaries but they had to incur considerable expenditure on the maintenance of troops. An officer might be allowed to maintain additional force known as Suwar. This was a privilege and not a right. The pay of this additional force was drawn from the treasury, keeping 5 per cent of the bill to the commander. The rank had further gradations namely the first, the second and the third which was determined by the Suwar rank. Below are given tables of the rank and the classes, the scales of salary and the incumbent expenditure.

40

Rank	Monthly Salary			Cost Of Appropriate Force
	First Class	Second Class	Third Class	
5,000	30,000	29,000	28,000	10,600
3,000	17,000	16,800	16,700	6,700
1,000	8,200	8,100	8,000	3,000
500	2,500	2,300	2,100	1,170
50	250	240	230	185
50	100	$82\frac{1}{2}$	75	44

This table gives us a very good idea about the economic position of the people of ranks. Yet we should not be entirely guided by this table. For we know that in many cases attempt was made to reduce the expenditure. Smaller sums were spent than the figures in the last column indicate. Akbar no doubt tried to check this malpractice. Then again another flaw was that often salaries were paid by granting Jagir. This system facilitated the getting of more money than the prescribed salary. Akbar personally disfavoured this system. Not that he had been successful in replacing the system by cash payment. The system of Jagir gained fresh force with Jehangir.

Those who were not fortunate enough to get into the service were not completely debarred from good employment. Akbar had a body of gentlemen at arms known as the Ahadis. Those who could not become mansabdar yet hoped to be Ahadis. Promotion to a mansabdar was quite possible for members of Ahadis. Usually these Ahadis were appointed to subordinate posts such as those of modern aide-de-camp or king's messenger. Yet they were distinctly higher than ordinary troopers. Many of them received more than Rs. 500 per month.

40. Reproduced From MORELAND W. D. "*India At The Death Of Akbar*", p. 66.

Economically the bulk of troopers are of no account. Yet we must consider their remuneration. It is obvious that they stood at the bottom of the scale. The pay of a mounted trooper was on paper about 7 or 8 rupees. In the artillery which was entirely Imperial the pay ranged from 7 to 3 rupees. The infantry was miscellaneous. For match-lock-men, wrestlers, gladiators, porters and slaves were included in the infantry. The match-lockmen were paid from 3 to 6 rupees monthly. Porters were paid from 2½ to 3 rupees. Gladiators and wrestlers were given from 2 to 15 rupees. Slaves were paid from a dam to a rupee daily. This clearly brings out the fact that payment was conditioned by whims and fancy. The difference between the earnings of cavalry-men and infantry-men partly explains the degraded social position of the latter. Thus service in cavalry was open to a gentleman whereas service in other branches was menial and hence a gentlman could not enter it.

An army of clerks was needed to maintain registers and accounts. Clerical service afforded employment to quite a substantial part of the population then. Unfortunately we have no statistics of their remuneration.

The method of assessing and collecting revenue provided employment to many others apart from the clerks. Subordinate revenue officers were appointed. They were given from about Rs. 20 to Rs. 50 per month. Thus they were in a comparatively favourable position.

The most important point about these various constituents of the Imperial and Court Service is that the bulk of the expenditure is controlled by a small minority of nobles. The expenditure on small fry was very insignificant. The attitude adopted by the higher ranks determined the welfare or otherwise of the common producers.

(b) As we turn to the study of the Professional class it must be first noted that the professional class did not possess its modern characteristics. The degree of independence which is the essential prerequisite for the proper functioning of a professional class did not obtain then. We know there was no effective middle class. There were no lawyers then. Very few professional teachers were there. Modern vocations or professionals such as those of journalists or politicians or engineers were absolutely out of question then. Teaching was usually combined with religion. In discussing the origin of the profession of teaching in English society we have seen how teachers were always men who belonged to the Church. A similar development can be marked in the Mughal society. Teaching was usually associated with religion. Whatever professionals were there had to depend on patronage. To use economic phraseology the professionals then had a narrow market. No lines of separation were distinctly drawn between various professions. It was possible for a versatile man to become a famous physician and a poet at the same time. Success was determined by patronage. Thus a good physician had to attach himself to Imperial Court or to some high officer to be able to get success and fame. Akbar is famous for having patronized talent. Often patronization took the form of a conferment of rank (mansab), the grant of stipends in land or cash, or special gifts or rewards. Ain-I-Akbari bears testimony to the grant of rank, stipends and rewards.

Conditions in the Deccan and Hindu states were not different from those described above. It would not be wrong to say that the service of

physicians was available only to Kings and Princes and Nobles. Common folk had to do without the aid of physicians.

(c) Domestic Servants:—The fundamental characteristic of the group that we are discussing is that it was essentially a consuming class, contributing very little to productive processes. This point is all the more established when we study the conditions of the domestic servants and slaves. So much labour was performed to satisfy personal needs. Quite an army of men was employed to render personal services. Some of them were free while others were slaves. Not that there was much difference between the condition of a free servant and that of a slave. The emperor set the example in this matter (maintainance of servants and slaves) to the nobles and the people. Thus in Akbar's zanana, which contained more than 5000 ladies, there were innumerable servants. The Imperial Camp employed about 2000 to 3000 servants over and above the guard of cavalry. Quite a big retinue was there. The nobles tried to imitate the Emperor by maintaining as many servants as possible. In fact a person of higher status had to keep many servants. The higher the status the more the servants. Nobles vied with each other in this respect with the inevitable consequence that the number of servants swelled to unprecedented heights.

The same position obtained in the Deccan and Hindu states as regards the employment of servants. There was a profusion of servants.

In addition to free servants there were many slaves. The only distinction between a free servant and a slave was that whereas the former was highered at rates sufficient enough for bare existence, the latter was not paid at all. An ordinary servant cost about 2 rupees monthly in Akbar's Court. The slaves were not paid monthly. They were purchased. Slaves were also captured during war, The condition of slaves was in many cases quite happy. Much depended on the owner. On the other hand a free servant was not often differently treated from a slave for all practical purposes.

Thus considerable amount of national energy was spent to satisfy the luxurious needs of the aristocracy. Had the same energy been used in productive pursuits the material welbeing and happiness of the generality of population could have increased manifold.

In the second group—Producers—we have included classes engaged in agriculture and industry. This division into agriculture and industry does not suggest that they were distinct. For in many instances both the activities were combined together. It was the usual practice for peasants to busy themselves with handicrafts in their sparetime. It was this practice which must have brought into use the term 'vacation' from agriculture'. In discussing the condition of classes engaged in agriculture we should start from the description of the agricultural system. It is contended that in Akbar's time there were more independent cultivators than agricultural labourers. MORELAND, after careful consideration of the pros and cons of the question, comes to the conclusion that in the sixteenth century there were many landless labourers. In support of his thesis MORELAND puts forth this argument that in the early nineteenth century we find many landless labourers who emerged from the position of serfs. Naturally this class must have either existed in Akbar's time or came into existence later. But since there is no evidence of such a social revolution in history the class must have existed in Ak-

bar's time.[41] To my mind this controversy is futile from our point of view. As long as we know the actual position social as well as economic of those engaged in agriculture it is not of much consequence whether they are called cutivators or landless labourers. Moreover earlier we had evidence of the sad plight of cultivators who left land due to the harassment of revenue officials. What is of importance to us is to see the economic position of those engaged in agriculture. As for the zamindars we have already seen that they were prosperous. They could extract more than prescribed revenue from cultivators. They were wealthy. Their wealth and power they owed to the Emperor. The system of zamindari was not necessarily hereditary.

The share of the produce demanded by Akbar was one third of the gross produce. Not much was left to the cultivator after paying the same. Since in many cases much more extorted out of them. In case of calamities like draught or famine their condition was much worsened. Famine stricken peasants had to sell their wives or children as slaves. The absence of sufficient surplus in the hands of cultivators always made them suceptible to ruinous conditions. The payment of revenue in cash further entailed on the cultivator the immediate sale of his produce after harvest. Prices are at their lowest after harvest. Hence he could not benefit from higher prices.

As for handicraftsmen there is no doubt that they displayed considerable skill in their products. The jewellers, silversmiths, workers in ivory, coral, amber or tortoise-shell, druggists, perfumers etc. were very famous in Akbar's time. But as noted earlier they had a very limited scope, having to cater for the demand of nobles' class. Patronage was not certain. Hence production could not be increased. Demand for their products was determined merely by whim and fancy of nobles and the upper class, hence very uncertain.

There was no such thing as industrial organization according to its modern conception. Usually production was carried on in small quantities. Furthermore the producers had to borrow capital. There was a chain of middlemen which accounts for the fact that the producer himself did not much profit even if prices offered were high. We have come across descriptions of big workshops (karkhana) whose production was carried on under supervision of experts in later period. Thus Bernier writes about later seventeenth century "Large halls are seen in many places called Karkhanas or Workshops for the artisans. In one hall embroiders are busily employed superintended by a master......"[42]. But as far as Akbar's reign is concerned there was not much of capitalist directed production. Production was carried out essentially by independent artisans who had scanty resources. As a natural consequence they had immediately to sell the goods. They could not hold on to get a better price. The artisans depended on purchasers or middlemen.

As we come to the question of wages we should bear in mind the condition then. There was plenty of slave labour available which had not to be given wages. Then again in the country labour could be paid in kind. Cultivating labourers were customarily paid in kind. It was only in the case of industrial labour and labourers in the Imperial Camp that

41. Ibid, pp. 112-113.
42. Quoted By MORELAND W. H. *"India At The Death Of Akbar"*, p. 186.

the question of paying wages arose. Wages was thus an essentially urban phenomenon then, and which remained so for a very long time. Thus when we discuss the wages we mean urban wages. Agricultural labourer was paid in commodities. So also it was the usual practice to pay the village artisan in commodities. Men were hired on pay only in cities and imperial camps. Earlier we have noted how the cultivators, 'driven to despair by excrable tyranny', left land and tried to seek employment in towns. We are reminded of the feudal condition in England where serfs migrated to towns to rid themselves of serfdom and earn better living

The labourers were divided into two classes the ordinary and the superior. Ordinary labourers were paid 2 dams (which is equivalent to 5½ annas) daily. Superior labourers were paid between 3 to 4 dams *i.e.* 8½ to 11 annas) daily. Carpenters were paid 3 to 7 dams (*i.e.* 8½ annas to Rupees 1.4) daily. Builders were paid 5 to 7 dams (*i.e.* 14 annas to Rupees 1.4) daily. These rates were usually prevalent in the Imperial Camp. Skill was obviously valued. Menial servants were given just enough for subsistence which came to about Rs. 2 per month or a dam daily.[43].

There was of course variation in the rates of wages from place to place. Yet as far as particular region was concerned there was remarkable uniformity of the rates of wages. The wages paid tended to be independent of the worker's craft. Pelsart quotes rate of wages at Agra which was Rs. 4 per month for all classes of artisans.

On the Eastern coast by the year 1620 the rates recorded by Methwold were as follows. Three pence a day, "finding themselves," were considered to be good wages for mastercraftsman. Servants of mastercrafsmen were paid one penny. Household servants were paid about Rs. 2 per month. The best master-workman got only Rs. 3½, ordinary artisans and servants of master craftsmen were given Re. 1 or even less than that.[44]

In 1637 ordinary servants were paid Rs. 3½ per month. Officers and men attached to Mughal Camp received between Rs. 3 to 10 per month. Thus by Jehangir's reign the wages of ordinary workers had increased. In South India servants in factory at Masulipatam obtained about Rs. 2 per month. By 1658 this rate had not changed.

It is indeed a rather curious fact that the rates of wages of skilled as well as ordinary workers remained more or less the same in Akbar's and Jehangir's times. Thus skilled worker got 6 to 7 dams daily in Akbar's time and 5 to 6 dams daily in Jehangir's time.

This fact can be partly explained by the functioning of the system of Dadani, giving advances. However profitable production might have been, the middle-man stood to gain and not the producer himself. The excessive price of raw material and the burden of various cesses imposed by the state left the artisan helpless. The artisans had no surplus to draw upon in difficult times. Hence they had to take resort to financiers and middlemen. These middlemen and financiers pocketed all the profits.

Life of the common people was dreary and sordid. As described by Pelsart "the life of the people can be described only as the home of

43. MORELAND W. H. "*India At The Death Of Akbar*".
44. MORELAND W. H. "*From Akbar To Aurangzeb*", p. 195.

stark want and the dwelling place of bitter woe".[45] And the worst part of it was that they could not hope to get out of that life. No climbing up was possible. A workman's child could follow no other occupation than that of his father's.

Earlier we have adverted to the fact that there was no middle class. There was the upper class and the lower class. Nevertheless there were professional physicians, merchants and traders who stood in between. The lower class was always on the verge of economic disaster. The people of the lower class had no means at their command with the help of which they could tide over difficult periods like famine. The debtors who could not repay the sum were sold. Famine and epidemics and the low economic level of the masses of the people was the main cause of their indebtedness. And it was a common practice to sell debtors as slaves. Slaves were employed in all types of labour but specially so in domestic employment. Once a slave always a slave since wages were mostly paid in kind *i.e.* commodities. Thus the opportunities of freedom from bondage were very few.

Regular gradations were made as far as the nature of work and wages are concerned. Thus during 1703-11 wages in Calcutta differed according to the nature of work performed. A shiqdar got Rs. 3 to 4 per month. A writer got Rs. 3 per month. Patwari got Rs. 2 per month. A book-binder Rs. 1-8 per month. Peon Rs. 1-8. Drummer As. 12. And a Halal Khor As. 8 to As. 12. In 1729 an ordinary worker was given daily 1 pice to 1½ pice. A skilled worker got 3 pice to 1 anna. In 1751—52 an ordinary worker received Rs. 2-8 per mensem, while a skilled artisan got 10 pice per day which would come to about Rs. 5 per month.

It has been noted by us that Aurangzeb's policy of warfare had devastating effects on agriculture: The chaos which ensued after his death disorganized the whole set-up. The viceroys of provinces took power in their own hands. Village life was shattered. Zamindars were appointed to collect revenue. The middle class which was but a small proportion was considerably weakened by British onslaught. The Mughal social structure degenerated.

The system of village communities meant self-sufficient villages. With the development of means of transport the self-sufficiency of villages was broken. The village communities ensured complete administration of village. In fact village communities were little self governments. Officers were appointed to govern. The peculiar nature of village communities was that most of the artisans were the servants. Division of labour was perfectly devised. The artisans got their due share. The system of Bara Balute is rightly famous as an example of thorough division of labour. The artisans were paid mostly in commodities. The occupations tended to be hereditary, rendering skilful operation possible. There were two important classes of inhabitants in the village communities. On the one hand were the office bearers and on the other were the cultivators. The office bearers had a right of settlement. Even the land came to be named according to the position of the holder. Thus in the Deccan various types of land were recognized. Meeras was the land belonging to village in its own right. Enam was the land granted as a gift. The Wawur was cultivable land. The village

45. Radhakamal MUKERJEE "*Economic History Of India—1600-1800*", p. 61.

officers exercised power over the grant of land. The people were divided into two classes, officers and cultivators. The Patil who was the headman was naturally included in the first class. Zamindars, Kulkarni were also included in the first class. Sutar, lohar, sonar, chambhar, parit, Joshi, guru, nhavee (barber) and muhar comprised the artisan class. The remuneration paid was in keeping with the importance of the class concerned. The entire village staff was divided into three classes. The first class comprised of the Sutar, lohar, chambhar and muhar. The second class consisted of kumbhar, nhavee, pureet. The third class comprised of the guru, bhut and mang. This was obviously a functional division made for the sake of convenience. The remuneration of each class was fixed. Of course remuneration was not in cash. The first class received at the harvest 30 sheaves of corn; the second 25 and the third 20. The Patil distributed this from the produce of the field. A direct link was thus established between the people and the government.[46]

The assumption of power by the British and centralization of government changed all this. The Patil is no longer what he was. He was reduced to the position of a mere servant of the state. Moreover to facilitate the collection of revenue the British government brought into prominence the class of Zamindars to whom was entrusted the duty of collecting revenue. The Britishers increased the amount of revenue considerably, so much so that after the payment of revenue very little remained to the farmer. The zamindars usually were money-lenders and as such extorted money from the peasants.

The gradual but sure decline of trade and industry made people run after service in the company and later on in the state. The educational policy was so devised as to produce clerks. Subordinate posts only were offered to the Indians. All higher posts were reserved for the Europeans. The education imparted to the people of India was by nature academic and not practical. It was least suited to the needs of the country. The crying need of the country, relieving the pressure on land by opening new industries was not at all fulfilled.

In 1812-20 the daily wages in the United Provinces of unskilled workers was 1 anna to 1a. 3ps., whereas a skilled worker got between 2as. to 3as. In 1850 an un-skilled worker got 1a. 3ps. to 1a. 6ps. A skilled worker got between 2as. to 3as. per day.[47] The author does not stop at this. He proceeds to study the real wages in terms of commodities. The index numbers of real wages in the U.P., given by Dr. Mukerjee, are very interesting. Thus, according to him if we regard the year 1600 as the base year the index number of real wages for both skilled and unskilled workers was 100.

Index Number Of Real Wages Of Unskilled Worker.[48]

BASE YEAR 1600

1600	100.0
1650	184.51
1729	64.02

46. Ref. CHOKSEY R. D. "*Economic History Of Bombay, Deccan And Karnatak*" 1818-1868, pp. 61-66.
47. Ref. Radhakamal MUKERJEE "*The Economic History Of India—1600-1800*", p. 50.
48. Ibid, p. 54.

1807	69.82
1812-20	35.98
1850	52.22
1870	43.15
1880	48.13
1890	36.48

Index Number Of Real Wages Of Skilled Worker.[49]

BASE YEAR 1600

1600	100.0
1650	123.36
1729	53.48
1807	62.02
1812-20	23.58
1850	29.35
1870	24.97
1880	25.68
1890	21.89

Though the figures quoted above are for the U.P., we get an idea as to the general condition prevailing in the country as a whole. The figures clearly indicate how the real wages dwindled with the decline in trade and industry and with foreign domination. We wish that the author had given relative figures of wages of the skilled and the unskilled workers. However, the interesting fact remains that the wages of skilled worker have dwindled more than those of unskilled worker. A plausible explanation of this interesting phenomenon seems to be twofold. In the first place, the wages of unskilled workers may have been so low that they could not have been reduced further. Secondly, the onslaught of foreign competition must have hit the skilled worker more than the unskilled. Here we cannot help being reminded of a similar phenomenon noted by us in our study of the English society..

49. Ibid, p. 54.

CHAPTER V

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BRITISH RULE AND AFTER

Plan Of The Chapter :

(I) The Effects of the British Rule on Social Organization.
(II) Social Classes and Differences in Income.
(III) Transitional Stage of Indian Society.

I

The British came into India as traders and eventually became the rulers. It is an interesting episode as to how they manœuvred the conquest of the country. Earlier we have noted how ramshackled the Mughal Empire had become. Nadir Shah's invasion of Delhi and the massacre in Delhi only made matters worse. Then the constant Afghan wars which culminated in the Battle of Panipat of 1761, wherein the growing Maratha power was given a setback, considerably weakened the Mughal Empire. The effete Shah Alam was only a titular sovereign with no power at all. The devastating policies adopted by the Marathas only hastened the decline. It is against this background that the British attained rule over India.

The East India Company was founded in 1609. The Company established trading relations in India. The French were also here for the same purpose. As a result of the Continental Wars there was enmity between the British and the French. This enmity resulted in wars between the British and the French in India which are known as the Karnatic Wars. The earlier successes of the French were not of much avail. For the ultimate victory was British. This victory of the British in 1763 eliminated their European rivals in India. Earlier Robert Clive had skilfully managed to win the Battle of Plassey in 1757. This victory meant the establishment of the Company's rule in Bengal. The Nawabs of Bengal were reduced to the position of puppets. Clive, by paying verbal allegiance to the titular sovereign obtained from him the Charter of Administration or Dewani in Bengal for the Company. Thus the Company's occupation of Bengal was legalised. Warren Hastings, the first Governor General of India, consolidated the earlier gains. He could extract considerable sums of money from the princes, Nawabs and traders. In the South, after Hyder Ali's demise his son was subdued. The Maratha power gave some cause for trouble to the British. But even that power was subdued ultimately owing to the lack of cohesion among the Marathas. Wellesley's Subsidiary System reduced effectively the power of the Maratha Chiefs. The dissolution of the Peshwai in 1818 and the annexation of the Peshwa's territories meant the final triumph of the Company's power. Then came the era of peace, which firmly established the British rule in India. Before Queen Victoria's accession to the throne the provinces of Bengal, Bombay, Madras and quite large portions of Northern India were already under British rule. The Company was divested first of its trading rights and subsequently of its ruling rights. From 1858 began the British rule in the technical sense of the term.

British rule was centralised thoroughly. It left no sector of life untouched. We have seen how the Mughal rule did not penetrate into the village life except for revenue collection. Village system had carried on unobstructed. But the centralized nature of the British rule did not leave the village bodies the autonomy they had enjoyed previously. First of all the isolation of the village was broken by the development of communications. Secondly the establishment of the Courts of Law divested the village communities of their major function, namely that of administering justice. The village system was complete in itself. This self-sufficiency was broken.

Wisely enough the British left untouched the caste system and the joint family system. This they did because the operation of these systems in no way hindered the effectiveness of their administration. However, indirect repercussions resulted out of the British rule even on these institutions. Due to uniformity of administration and justice the hierarchy of caste was broken as far as the economic prospects of the various castes were concerned. The lessening of opportunities made for competition between the various castes. There was keen competition for all kinds of posts amongst all the castes.

Inroads were made into the joint family system not by legislation but by the economic conditions. The self-sufficiency of villages being broken, people had to seek employment in the towns. Moreover, the anglicization of administration left few lucrative posts and positions for the Indians. In the earlier days of the British rule all important positions were held by Europeans. The British policy on education was so devised as to strengthen their hold on the country. The introduction of English as the medium of instruction had significant consequences. Only the upper classes and the middle classes could take to learning English. Moreover "the educational system of India produced a literary class far in excess of the country's needs."[1]

However, it must be admitted that the freedom of speech and the spread of higher education which have been British gifts to India facilitated the development of the spirit of nationalism. Rightly observes Dr. A. R. DESAI that "Indian nationalism is a modern phenomenon. It came into being during the British period as a result of the action and interaction of numerous subjective and objective forces and factors which developed within the Indian society under the condition of the British rule and the impact of world forces".[2] The development of nationalism was reflected in the critical attitude adopted by Indian leaders towards alien government. The inevitable corollary to the development of nationalism was the increasing demand for self-government. And for obvious reasons, the main ground of criticism of the State policy came to be the economic. "With the dawn of political consciousness came a desire for economic independence. India's dependence on foreign manufacturers came to be felt as a stigma........"[3]

The story of British rule in India is very interesting. The British came here as traders and became rulers. With the change in their position trading terms were radically changed. It cannot be gainsaid that

1. PILLAI, P. P.—*Economic Conditions in India*, p. 35.
2. DESAI, A. R.—*Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, p. xiv.
3. PILLAI, P. P.—*Economic Conditions in India*, p. 35.

they first came to India to exploit the possibilities of trade. As they gained political power they could exploit the country economically more and more to suit their own purpose. In fact the whole history can be adequately titled as the drama of exploitation-economic cum political. We are once again reminded of Loria's famous thesis of 'Connective Institutions'.[4] This is not to deny the attendant benefits of the British rule. For the benefits are obvious. Thus they established the much needed peace, order and security of life. Representative Government has been a British contribution. Efficient administration was promoted by them. The development of means of communication, the railways, the telegraph and development of modern industries have been their achievement. All these achievements are beyond dispute.

But if we were to prepare a balance sheet of the ills and rights done by the British rule the balance would show that the number of ills and wrongs certainly exceeds the rights. From the very establishment of the rule of the East India Company, systematic attempts were made to discourage Indian manufactures and industries. India was very advanced industrially during the eighteenth century. Resulting out of the competition between different European powers Indian trade in calicoes, indigo and saltpetre recorded phenomenal expansion during the seventeenth century. India not only produced necessaries but also luxuries in quantities sufficient not only for home consumption but also for exporting abroad. Organisation of Indian trade and commerce displayed the high standards reached. With her export of cloth, India at the end of the seventeenth century "threatened to kill English woollen and silk industries".[5] Britain had to impose import duty on Indian calicoes. India had a balanced economy then. There was no excessive pressure on land. The proverbial vacation from land was wisely utilized in industries and manufactures. But with the imposition of duties on Indian calicoes in London in 1700, Indian trade shrank. The East India Company and the British Parliament so devised their policy as to discourage Indian manufactures. True that the native system of dadani—giving advances to craftsmen was mainly responsible for giving them control over production. This evil practice has been lamented over by all the authorities on Indian Economic Problems. The glorious position which India occupied in the world prior to the Industrial Revolution of England was lost due to many factors. European piracy in Asiatic waters gave an unreparable blow to Indian shipping, industry and commerce. The policy pursued by the princes at home was suicidal inasmuch as it gave concessions and preference to foreign trade. And the British policy of restricting imports of Indian fine products had adverse effects on the production of such goods. It would be quite correct to say that England was able to bring about her Industrial Revolution as a result of the hold she possessed on India. In pursuance of her Mercantilist policy England discouraged Indian imports. This policy was carried to the length of making India subservient to the industries of England and ultimately make her a supplier of raw materials for Britain's industries. Moreover the financial gains which accrued to England as a result of her administration of India

4. cf. Loria's Thesis. Op. Cit. A. LORIA—*"The Economic Foundations of Society"*.
5. MUKHERJEE Radhakamal—*"The Economic History of India"*, 1600-1800, p.v. Introduction.

gave the much needed capital to finance her industrial revolution. Well might HAMILTON complain about the exaggerated notions of the drain on India. Yet the fact remains that there was a considerable amount of drain which came in very handy for British industrialists. HAMILTON himself quotes Montgomery Martin who spoke of "the immense and absolutely incalculable amount of specie exported from India between 1757 and 1770".[6] Brooks Adams pertinently remarks that "possibly since the world began no investment has ever yielded the profit reaped from the Indian plunder. Very soon after Plassey the Bengal plunder began to arrive in London and the effect appears to have been instantaneous, for all authorities agreed that the Industrial Revolution began with the year 1760".[7] DIGBY who has quoted Adams with approval has something to add to this and says that between Plassey and Waterloo as much as a thousand million pounds were transferred from India to England. DIGBY opines that "England's industrial supremacy owes its origin to the vast hoards of Bengal and the Karnatic".[8] HAMILTON decries such explanations as ludicrous. He states that the notion of the drain arose from the mistaken distinction made between inland and foreign trade. According to him there is no distinction between economic nation and political nation. Admitting the difference between the drain arising out of inland trade and that out of foreign trade, he says that "to draw a rigid distinction between the two kinds of drain, therefore, is based upon an error in economic analysis".[9] We are not concerned with the niceties of economic analysis. We are concerned with crude facts. And they clearly point out how India's wealth has been drained by English policy. HAMILTON himself is fully aware of the repercussions of the English control over India's manufacture and industry arising out of the system of giving advances to producers. Thus he accepts that "in these ways the Company may be said, loosely, to have exercised a monopoly".[10]

Once industrial revolution was worked out England needed free markets to flood them with her manufactured goods. The whole commercial policy was framed to suit England's needs. Import duties were imposed on Indian manufactures. Only raw material was encouraged. English textile industry was encouraged at the cost of Indian industry. Export of machinery was banned. HAMILTON, the apologist of English policy, remarks that "left to themselves the Indian producers failed to make an article which could compete successfully with the products of China and Japan in quality, while by neglecting to adopt the improved methods of production they suffered a serious disadvantage in respect of cost".[11] But is it in fairness to say that the Indian producers were left to themselves? This is a fundamental question. It is indeed far from a fact that the Indian producers were left to themselves. Various restrictions were imposed on them. And only when they were completely dissociated with new methods of production that freedom of production

6. HAMILTON, C. J.—*The Trade Relations between England and India*, 1600-1896, p. 132.
7. Ibid, p. 133.
8. DIGBY, W.—*Prosperous British India*, p. 31.
9. HAMILTON, C. J.—*Trade Relations Between England and India*, 1600-1896, p. 134.
10. Ibid, p. 151.
11. Ibid, p. 183.

was granted. Once they had lagged far behind were they allowed to compete freely. The words of H. H. Wilson as quoted by R. C. DUTT admirably sum up the entire situation. It was not a fair competition between the Indian and the British manufacturer. The British manufacturer "employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms".[12] Many persons lost their occupation. This loss of earnings to millions of Indian artisans meant additional dependence on land.

The proverbial vacation from land ceased to obtain. Moreover the land policy adopted by the British administrator was ruinous to Indian agriculture. Land revenue was too high to leave sufficient margin for the cultivators. That the demand of revenue was excessive becomes quite clear. Colonel Briggs' remark (quoted by R. C. DUTT) in 1830, viz. "a land tax like that which now exists in India professing to absorb the whole of the landlord's rent, was never known under any Government in Europe or Asia".[13]

The disintegration of village communities, little republics, ensued out of British administration. British revenue policy and de-personalization of the burden of revenue was responsible in breaking old village communities. The development of road and mechanisation of transport broke the self-sufficing independence of villages. The British policy of creating a class of zamindars made matters easy for them. Due to lack of employment in trade and industry the children of this zamindar class took up service in the Company. And British educational policy favoured the development of such class. Even the policy of appointing Indians to high posts was undertaken with a view to soften the bitterness which had arisen out of the fact of exploitation.

Most pertinently D. R. GADGIL, well known Indian Economist, observes three stages in the development of British rule. The first stage marked the establishment of British rule in India. The second stage marked the consolidation and the third the exploitation of India's natural resources. As admirably pointed out by him, these three stages can be visibly discerned in the economic policy of the British Government in India.[14] The author is adequately mindful of the limitations of the working of a "superimposed foreign administrative machinery".[15] Has it been said for nothing that a self government is better than good (foreign) government! It is for this reason that Mill eulogises self-government and condemns foreign government. For it is quite in the nature of things that the interests of the governed and the governors should be at variance.

Claims are usually made that the British rule has given to India a sense of unity. True, but that sense of unity arose out of foreign administration with the main objective of strengthening her own position. Has this not been clearly reflected in the economic condition of India after two hundred years of British rule? Vera ANSTEY, a well known British authority on Indian economic problems very clearly states that though it cannot be denied that benefits have accrued to India out of British connections such as the imports of cheap manufactures, introduction of pub-

12. DUTT, R. C.—*Economic History of India; Early British Rule*, Preface, p. viii.
13. Ibid, p. x.
14. GADGIL, D. R.—*The Industrial Evolution of India, Preface*, p. xv.
15. Ibid, p. xvi.

lic works, higher crops, etc., yet the fact remains that "a country which had manufactured and exported the finest muslins and other luxurious fabrics, at a time when the ancestors of the British were living an extremely primitive life, has failed to take part in the economic revolution initiated by the descendants of those same wild barbarians".[16] The same authority further states that the change in production was brought about at the cost of a change in relations. Thus "these changes brought about a peculiar interdependence between India and the West, whereby India tended to produce and export in the main raw materials and foodstuffs, and to import textiles, iron and steel goods, machinery and miscellaneous manufactures of the most varied description".[17] I cannot resist the temptation of adducing further proof in support of the view expressed above. As it happens it is not so much a matter of view as a matter of fact as to the results of British rule on India. Daniel F. BUCHANAN comes to the same conclusions as Vera ANSTEY as far as the effects of British rule are concerned. Thus he expresses his astonishment: "Here was a country with all the crude elements upon which manufacturing depends, yet during more than a century it has imported factory made goods in large quantities and has developed only a few of the simplest industries for which machinery and organisation had been highly perfected in other countries. With abundant supplies of raw cotton, raw jute, easily mined coal, easily mined and exceptionally high-grade iron ore; with a redundant population often starving because of lack of profitable employment; with a hoard of gold and silver, second perhaps to that of no other country in the world, and with access through the British Government to a money market which was lending large quantities of capital to the entire world; with an opening under their own flag for British business leaders who were developing both at home and in numerous new countries, all sorts of capitalistic industries; with an excellent market within her own borders and near at hand in which others were selling great quantities of manufactures; with all these advantages, India after a century, was supporting only about two per cent of her population by factory industry".[18] And this development is quite in keeping with the forces of influence to which India was subject. As pointed out by our author "Britishers had occupied an important place in Indian economic affairs for a century and a half before they acquired political power".[19] This is a sufficient indictment on British rule in India.

As far as the social structure is concerned, the Britishers were wise enough not to affect it directly. They did not interfere in the caste system. But economic and industrial forces impinged on social structure. Economic circumstances necessitated the so-called members of high caste to accept even low jobs. The shattering of economy or rather the arrested development of the body economic resulted in a scramble for jobs. The British educational policy was such as to produce clerks. Functional education was discouraged. No doubt they have introduced higher education. But much has remained to be done.

16. Vera ANSTEY—*The Economic Development of India*, p. 5.
17. Ibid, p. 5.
18. BUCHANAN, Daniel, F.—*The Development of Capitalistic Enterprise in India*, pp. 450-51.
19. Ibid, p. 453.

The establishment of the British rule in India effectively interfered with the village life and especially with the village communities. The Patil was reduced to the position of a servant. So also the Kulkarni met with the same fate. As such they were made directly subordinate to their immediate superiors. Henceforth they had to sever economic relations with the village. They owed allegiance to their superiors. In the Deccan or rather in the Maharashtra, regulations were made in the year 1853 whereby the Patil and Kulkarni came to be paid a fixed percentage of the revenue collected. Thus the Patil was to receive for the first Rs. 1000 of the gross revenue of the village, 3%; for the second Rs. 1000, 2%; and for the rest of the gross revenue above Rs. 2000, 1%.[20] In addition to this he was to get a fixed annual allowance which would be Re. 1, when the gross revenue was between Rs. 11 and Rs. 20; Rs. 2½ when the gross revenue was between Rs. 31 and Rs. 50; of Rs. 10 whenever it exceeded Rs. 50.[21] The Kulkarni was to get for the first Rs. 1000 of gross revenue of his village 5%; for the second Rs. 1000, 4%; for the third Rs. 1000, 3%; for the fourth Rs. 1000, 2%; and for the rest of the revenue which was over and above Rs. 4000, 1%.[22] In addition to this, he was to get a fixed allowance of Rs. 2 when the gross revenue was between Rs. 21 and Rs. 30; Rs. 10 when it was more than Rs. 30 but did not exceed Rs. 1000; when the gross revenue was more than Rs. 1000 he was to get Rs. 60 per month as salary.[23] It was customary to pay the salary quarterly.[24]

The decline of industry and trade gave rise to the class of wage earners. Those who could have a small business of their own were wiped out by the outside competition. They had to take recourse to employment in service. The working of industrial revolution had serious repercussions on the small trader and producer in India. "The Industrial Revolution of England" led to the decline of Indian industries as "its reflex action on India" was "hastened by the new policy of linking up the country with external markets prior to the linking up of the several isolated provinces of the country itself".[25]

II

Earlier we have seen how the decline of industries and trade resulted in additional pressure on land. Undue pressure on land combined with excessive demands of revenue by the state led to the pauperisation of the people at large. In the wake of pauperisation came the necessity of migration of labour. The European owned plantations were ever willing to absorb incoming labour. In fact they needed labour which was cheap. No apology is given for quoting at length the testimony of Indian labour whicn formed part of the evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1831-32. The testimony brings out the salient features of Indian

20. CHOKSEY, R. D.—*The Economic History of the Bombay, Deccan and the Karnatak*, p. 76.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid, p. 76.
23. Ibid, p. 76.
24. Ibid, p. 76.
25. PILLAI, P. P.—*Economic Condition in India*, p. 2.

labour. "The natives in general bear an advantageous comparison with those of any country in the world........ The inhabitants of Bombay are quite equal, if not superior, to those of towns in England. They are an uncommonly sharp and intelligent people........ The wages of a Hindu carpenter would be 6d. a day, of a Chinese 2s. and of an European, the lowest Superintendent of carpenters, 6s......... The average rate of wages in Burdwan is from 5s. to 8s. a month. In Calcutta five or six coolies may be hired for the day for a rupee; at Ramnad three men or five women, will cost from sunrise to sunset not quite 4d. Their labour is equal to that of Europeans. They are poorly fed and thinly clad. The rate of agricultural wages is certainly under 3s. a month".[26]

Decades and centuries do not provide the necessary demarcating method with regard to social phenomena. Certain phenomena flower in a particular decade or century. Many are the years required for the working of social process which appears to us to have flowered and given rise to a particular social phenomenon. Thus we have seen that the subjection of India by Britain, though finally consummated after the revolution of 1857, was the outcome of an infinitely complex process which was long drawn. Economic, political and social forces brought it about. Even with regard to the working of these forces it cannot be said with precision as to when one force preponderated over other. To be concrete it is very difficult to say when the economic force gained preponderance over other forces in India. In fact it is even difficult to speak about such preponderance. Nevertheless we can say in the case of India that it was from the nineteenth century onwards that the economic force came to preponderate over other forces, though of course the final consummation was brought by a political event. We have noticed how the entire economic system was changed. And we do so on good authority. Below is given a rather longish extract from the report of the Commission on Christian Higher Education in India, which was headed by no less a person than A. D. LINDSAY, who is reputed for his anti-Marxian views. "It was not till the nineteenth century that the economic foundations on which Indian society had been built up were substantially modified, and hence the changes of the last hundred years have proved to be more fundamental than those which had preceded them. To the political writings and orations of Edmund Burke and of other British political philosophers and to the educational policy of Macaulay are sometimes attributed the revolutionary changes in the Indian outlook. While this may be true in some measure, of even great significance are the results that followed from the activities in India of the company of English merchants who exemplified in the East that economic thought and practice of which Adam Smith was the philosopher and James Watt the exponent".[27]

True, the economic foundations on which Indian society was built up were substantially modified. It has been claimed that Indian economy was put on an international basis.[28] There is certainly a core of truth in the statement that in India there has been a sudden transition from village economy to international economy. We have earlier noticed how

26. Reproduced from N. C. SINHA'S "*Studies in Indo-British Economy Hundred Years Ago.*" pp. 55-56.
27. *Report of the Commission on Christian Higher Education in India*, pp. 29-30.
28. P. A. WADIA and G. N. JOSHI—*The Wealth of India*, p. 158.

the village formed the most important unit in every respect. With the establishment of British rule, and the development of communications and transport India was made very susceptible to foreign influences. The peculiar nature of control over India by the British meant that India became a mere supplier of raw materials and an importer of manufactures. India was linked with the outside world, to her disadvantage. India was not in a position to carry on with other nations on terms of equality. The logical development of capitalism, large scale industrialization could not take place due to alien domination. The interests of India were definitely relegated to the background by the interests of Britain.

As a natural consequence we got an economy which was at once medieval and modern. This can be very well discerned from the figures of population employed in various occupations. We quote figures given by SHAH and KHAMBATA. In 1921 agriculture supported 70.9 per cent of the population; industry supported 10.7 per cent; commerce 7.1; professions 1.6; other occupations 9.7. The authors give us interesting information about the proportion of workers and dependents in various occupations. Thus in agriculture workers constituted 45% while dependents were 55%. In industry it (proportion) was 48% and 52% respectively; in commerce 44% and 56%; in professions 41% and 59%; in other occupations 54% and 46%.[29] These figures very clearly bring out the backward nature of Indian economy. Even by 1931 there was no substantial change in the proportion of population engaged in the various occupations.[30] The census figures for 1931 indicate that the percentage of population dependent on agriculture had dwindled down to 65.6 from 73.0 in 1921. These figures give us a false indication since the bases of classification were changed in 1931. Vera ANSTEY comes to the conclusion, after a careful study of the occupational distribution of population, that "probably there has been little change since 1891 in the proportion of the population dependent upon agriculture, but the proportion engaged in 'organized' industries has increased, particularly in certain provinces at the expense of the 'unorganised industries'."[31] It is indeed a commonplace that our indigenous industries declined due to the British domination. The change in the tastes of the people brought about by foreign domination also formed one of the causes of the decline of indigenous industries. We need not labour this obvious point any further.

Now we proceed to study the distribution of the national income among various groups of people. We take into account all the classes—productive as well as unproductive. In an earlier chapter we have noticed how distribution gives us a clue to the valuations of a society. In fact distribution is nothing if not a valuation of the services rendered by people. Why distribution is of a particular type and not of another is a question which we shall deal with later on. For the present we shall merely study the distribution of income as it has been and as it is. We have already studied the occupational distribution of population in brief. As far as the earlier period is concerned, we have studied the distribution of income as amongst various groups and classes of population. We have remarked that distribution was very faulty. Now we turn to the study

29. SHAH and KHAMBATA—*The wealth and Taxable Capacity of India*, p. 294.
30. cf. M. VISVESWARAYA—*Planned Economy for India*, pp. 398-99.
31. Vera ANSTEY—*The Economic Development of India*, p. 65.

of the distribution of income in modern period that is from the beginning of the twentieth century. Or, rather we should study from the last quarter of the nineteenth century.We shall later on see how the establishment of British rule had serious repercussions on the distribution of income.

As we study the distribution of income we have in mind occupational distribution of population as well. It is indeed needless to state that we also study the per capita income, which gives us an idea of the economic condition of the country as a whole. Thus during the year 1868 according to calculations made by D. NAOROJI, the per capita income was Rs. 20.[32] In 1881, according to official estimate it was Rs. 27. Lord Curzon, in reply to Dutt's charges, stated the per capita income as being Rs. 30 in 1897-98. William DIGBY, the celebrated author of Porsperous British India, calculates the same at Rs. 18 for the year 1899. But we need not consider this as corresponding to reality since the author does not take into account the income for services. According to Findlay SHIRRAS, the per capita income for the year 1911 was Rs. 49.[33] Wadia and Joshi tell us that the per capita income for the year 1913-14 was Rs. 44½,[34] after deducting foreign liabilities. SHAH and KHAMBATA, calculating for the year 1921-22, tell us that it was Rs. 74.[35] Obviously enough here allowance must be made for the prevalence of higher prices, arising out of war, than before. *The Report of the Simon Commission* places the per capita income for the same year (1921-22) at Rs. 116.[36] Obviously enough their calculation is the most optimistic calculation permissible. It clearly reflects the view point of the Commission. Dr. V. K. R. V. RAO in his study of the National Income of India for the quinquennium 1925-29 gives us the figure of Rs. 78[37] as the annal per capita income. According to the *Report of the Central Banking Inquiry Commitee,* the per capita income for the year 1928 was Rs. 42.[38] This low figure can be easily explained when we consider that the Committee included only agricultural incomes. Findlay SHIRRAS in an official inquiry into the poverty and kindred economic problems in India concludes that the per capita income for the year 1930 was $40.3, which comes to about Rs. 63.[39] Dr. V. K. R. V. RAO calculating for the year 1931-32 comes to the conclusion that the per capita income was Rs. 62.[40] Thus there is very little difference between the official estimate and a personal estimate. After all facts, however sordid they may be, cannot be denied. Sir James GRIGG, Finance Member of the Government of India, in the Budget Speech in the Central Assembly, April 1938 stated that the per capita income for the year 1937-38 was Rs. 56.[41]

And this after all is only the gross income from which deductions should be made for the Home Charges, India has had to pay. Similarly,

32. Dadabhai NAOROJI—*Poverty and the British Rule in India*, p. 31.
33. G. Findlay SHIRRAS—*The Science of Public Finance*, Vol. I, p. 251.
34. P. A. WADIA and G. N. JOSHI—*The Wealth of India*, p. 108.
35. K. T. SHAH and K. J. KHAMBATA—*Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India*, p. 201.
36. Simon Commission Report.
37. V. K. R. V. RAO—*An Essay in India's National Income*, 1925-29, p.
38. *Report of the Central Banking Inquiry Committee*, Vol. I, p. 39.
39. G. Findlay SHIRRAS—*Poverty and Kindred Economic Problems in India*, p. 19.
40. V. K. R. V. RAO—*The National Income of British India*, 1931-32, p. 185.
41. Quoted by Rajni Palme DUTT in "*India Today*", p. 28.

excess of Indian exports over imports must be taken into account. And after all this we should bear in mind that the figures of per capita income give us only the average, if income were equally distributed. Since we know it for certain that it is far from so, we can very well imagine what must be the condition of an ordinary man. We shall discuss all this after scrutinizing the effect of Home Charges, excess of exports and other liabilities arising out of British domination. Rajni Palme DUTTA gives us figures of the "Growth of tribute from India to England."[42]

(The figures are in £ millions)

	1851	1901	1913-14	Post-depression 1933-34
Home Charges	2.6	17.3	19.4	27.5
Excess of Indian Exports	3.3	11.0	14.2	69.7

These figures need no comment. The various authors cited above corroborate the figures. Even Findlay SHIRRAS[43], an apologist of British rule accepts the fact of the heavy liability on the already slender Indian resources of foreign charges. All this liability has definitely arrested Indian development. There can be no doubt about that.

The distribution of income in India has been very vitally conditioned by its lowness. Undue pressure on land, lack of industrilisation, foreign domination, etc., have contributed to the small size of India's national income. This is not to justify the faultiness of distribution. It has been and still is evidently faulty. Thus in 1913-14, the distribution of national income was such that more than a third of the wealth of the country was enjoyed by about one per cent or 5 per cent, making allowance for dependents; another third or slightly more than that, about 85 per cent of the annual wealth, was enjoyed by about 30 per cent of population; while the rest of the population i. e. 60 per cent had to rest content with 30 per cent of the total wealth produced.[44] And this is not at all surprising in the light of the fact that land is overburdened. More than 60 per cent of the population was being supported by agriculture. The excessive pressure on land, resulting out of the absence of opportunities of employment in other fields explains the degraded condition of the peasant. The system of plantations could thrive only due to this fact. It is a commonplace that labourers on the plantations were servile and not free in the real sense of the term. But they had no other go than work on the plantations. That conditions have not substantially changed is amply borne out by Dr. Rao's figures pertaining to the distribution of income in 1931-32. Dr. RAO gives us figures of the distribution of income as between (1) the earners engaged in agriculture, pasture, hunting and fishing; (2) earners in industry and (3) earners in services, including trades, transport, Government, professions and domestic servants. Thus the first group whose strength was 70.3 millions, 69 per cent of the total population, shared only 52.8 per cent of the total income. The second group whose strength was about 15 per cent of the total population shared 16.9 per cent of the total income. And the third group which was about 130 million strong retained 22.6 per cent of total income.[45] These figures

42. Ibid, p. 111.
43. cf. G. Findlay SHIRRAS—*Poverty and Kindred Economic Problems in India*, p. 57.
44. K. T. SHAH and K. J. KHAMBATA—*Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India*, p. 307.
45. V.K.R.V. RAO—*The National Income of British India*, 1931-32, p. 187.

bear eloquent testimony to the unjust character of distribution. In India the distribution of income can be studied from another angle also. Thus if we consider the distribution of income as between the urban population and the village population, the character of distribution can be most easily marked. It is a well known fact that in India the percentage of urban population is slightly more than 10, the remaining population being rural. Hence the study of the distribution of income as between urban and rural earners the salient feature of the same, viz. its inequitability is easily brought forth. Dr. RAO tells us that the income per earner belonging to the urban group was Rs. 436 in the year 1931-32, whereas the income per earner of rural group came to Rs. 142 only. The corresponding figures for per capita income are Rs. 166 and Rs. 51 respectively.[46] Thus the overwhelming majority of the people got at best only Rs. 51 per head per year whereas a minority of people got more than thrice per head of what their brethern (rural) got. Of course this is only the average, which does not obtain in practical life. In actuality there are greater inequalities of income. Thus if we consider the urban group, it is estimated that nearly half of their total income belongs to less than ten per cent of their total number.[47] That means the remaining half of the total income of the urban group is shared by more than ninety per cent of their population. Further even if we consider the well-to-do earners in the urban group, whose annual income exceeds Rs. 2000, it is revealed that 38 per cent of their number could get only 17 per cent of the total income "while a little more than 1 per cent were in possession of as much as 10 per cent".[48] As we consider the rural group there also we find inequalities of income. This is obviously due to the fact that the landlords and moneylenders appropriate most of the total income. The absence of income tax on land makes it rather difficult to calculate precisely, as could be done in the case of the urban group, the distribution of income. Yet the size of holdings can give us a fairly good idea of the distribution of income. The average small size of holdings indicates this clearly. Figures of holdings are available only for the Province of Bombay. Thus out of 22 lakhs of registered holders of land in Bombay (Province), at least 10 lakhs had holdings of below 5 acres in size. And they cultivated only 9 per cent of the total cultivated land in the province. On the other hand, less than 1 per cent of the land-holders (obviously big holders) had between them 16 per cent of the total land. Thus there was great disparity between incomes. As far as other provinces are concerned the percentage of land holders who had holdings of below 5 acres in size seems to be quite high namely above 65.[49] These facts clearly bring out the unequal distribution of income as far as the rural group is concerned.

Additional proof of the same fact namely the unequal distribution of income in India can be obtained. Thus considerable light is thrown on the inequality of incomes and the general low level of income in India by the commercial estimate of the Indian Market in the Times Trade and Engineering Supplement of April 1939. According to this estimate the

46. Ibid, p. 188.
47. Ibid, p. 189.
48. Ibid, pp. 189-90.
49. Ibid, p. 190.

range of incomes of Indian households was as follows[50] :—

Income in Rs.			*No. of Households.*
Over 100,000	..	..	6,000
Averaging 5,000	..	..	270,000
„ 1,000	..	..	250,000
„ 200	..	..	35,000,000
„ 50	..	..	the remainder

This table, which was compiled for commercial purposes, needs no comment.

Now we shall study in detail the earnings and social position in the various callings right from professions, liberal arts, public administration and services, to workers on plantations. We start with the Professions, liberal arts, public administration and services. Then we consider earnings in Industry, Trade and Transport and Agriculture. Having done that we study the earnings on plantations. This classification is certainly not meant to be rigid. For certain occupations like mining, though falling under the head of industry, can as well be included under agriculture.

The method of classification can be justified on both economic grounds as well as social grounds. Economically considered, the constituents of this group earn the highest income. We have already noticed how small a percentage of the total population is formed by those classed under professions, liberal arts, public administration and services. We have also noticed how their share in the total income has been disproportionately large. Socially considered, they stand very high in the hierarchy. Purposely we say very high and not highest for we know the peculiar nature of Indian social estimation where saints and sanyasis are regarded as next to the Almighty God only.

The earnings in professions and liberal arts are quite high so far as earned incomes are concerned. This can be proved by facts and figures. Thus amongst those who are classed under professions and liberal arts as many as 3 per cent are income-tax payers. As we shall see a little later, the percentage of income-tax payers in this group is only second to that in the services group. Amongst the total number of earners under this head, which was 1440,000 as many as 37,000 were income-tax payers.[51] Amongst those tax-payers the proportion of Law, Medicine and Instruction was 3 : 3 : 2 respectively.[52] We have already considered the income-tax payers, *i.e.* those who had annual income of Rs. 1000 at least. As to those whose incomes were below the income-tax limit, *i.e.*, below Rs. 1000 per year, we shall classify them into various heads such as religion, law, medicine, instruction and letters, arts and science. It is quite obvious that all these belong essentially to the middle class. Their social status is on a par with that of the majority of Government servants. As many as 514,000 were classed under the head religion. Their per capita annual income is estimated to have been Rs. 200. There were 90,000 classed under Law and their per capita annual income was Rs. 360. This figure can be very easily explained in terms of the people who were included under this head. Even clerks in the legal profession were includ-

50. *The Times Trade and Engineering Supplement*—"Indian Market", April 1939.
51. Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 130.
52. Ibid, p. 169.

ed. In medicine there were 227,000 earners and their per capita annual income was Rs. 360. The same explanation can be given here as in the case of law. For under medicine nurses and midwives as well as quacks were included. Under instruction there were 366,000 earners whose per capita annual income was Rs. 320. Here again secondary teachers as well as primary teachers were included. Under Letters, arts and sciences there were 206,000 earners and their per capita annual income was Rs. 200.[53]

The earnings in public administration and services must be rated as the highest so far as earned incomes are considered. This salient feature is easily brought out if we just consider the number of income-tax payers amongst them. The number of income-tax payers amongst those employed in public administration and services is as high as 142,000 in a total number of earners which is 1,627,000.[54] The percentage figure works at about 8.75, the highest percentage figure of income-tax payers taking into account even industry and trade. Moreover if we look to the proportion which is formed by the salaries to the total governmental expenditure we are easily convinced that they are very highly paid. Dr. Rao's laborious research tells us that in 1931-32 taking into account all the seven provincial governments, the percentage of salaries formed 44.4 per cent of total expenditure.[55]

Now we analyse their earnings. Prior to that we should consider the entire politico-economic background which has shaped them. The British as we know established their rule over India in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The administration of the country was entirely in their hands. The Mutiny of 1857 strengthened the policy of non-Indianisation of responsible posts. The administrative system was run by British Civil Servants who had to come to India all the way from England. They were open to the inconveniences such as tropical diseases, hot climate, distance from home, etc. As such it was deemed essential to pay them handsomely. Accordingly, by the Statute of 1853 the salary of each member of the Supreme Council was fixed at Rs. 80,000 per year and that of each member of the Legislative Council at Rs. 50,000 per year. On the basis of these salaries the annual salary of the Chief Justice of the Sudder Court at Calcutta was fixed at Rs. 48,000. Needless to say that in those days no Indian was appointed as high official. So the question of high salaries related only to Europeans. But gradually as Indianisation of higher posts took place, the problem of high salaries was taken up. Provincial posts came to be created which carried lower salaries than the Imperial posts did. But the Provincial scales were also kept unduly high. Indians came also to be appointed in the Imperial Service. The scales of remuneration in the Imperial Services were kept high enough to attract best British talent. But even when Indians were not handicapped by the disadvantages mentioned above came to be appointed, the scales would not be revised. The only step taken was to create provincial posts for Indians. But this remedy would not work for the simple reason that the provincial scales themselves were determined on the Imperial scales. Thus the highest pay for any individual office recommended by

53. All these figures are adopted from the same source, p. 170.
54. Ibid, p. 130.
55. Ibid, p. 160.

the Bombay Retrenchment Committee, 1923 was Rs. 2,000 per month for Commissioners or Secretaries to Government. All this resulted in undue pressure on the finances of the provincial Governments as well as the Central Government.[56]

This had a cumulative effect inasmuch as all other employments had to offer high scales to attract Indians of the same type. Thus as rightly pointed out by D. R. GADGIL, the new Indian Universities which were mostly staffed by Indians paid salaries in some cases even more than what the British Universities did. A scale of £ 800 to £ 1000 per annum for a professor in English University would get the best talent. A similar post in India would carry about Rs. 750 to Rs. 1,250 per month.[57] This is only a case in point.

The peculiar nature of Indian economy does not permit such high scales. Moreover even the laws of supply and demand do not necessitate such high scales. It is quite understandable that the salary of a public official should be high enough to keep him above want. It is also understandable that his social position demands that he should be paid higher than the skilled artisan classes. But there must be some proportion between the earnings of a public official and those of labourers. It is the usual experience in various countries that there is very little difference between the remunerations of the lowest public official and of a labourer. Thus in the U.K. the annual wages of an unskilled labourer were Rs. 1333, whereas the lowest clerical salary was Rs. 1266 and the highest administrative salary was Rs. 40,000. But in India the corresponding figures of earnings were Rs. 240, Rs. 360 and Rs. 48,000.[58] The figures of salaries obtaining in the Bombay Presidency would bring the point home better. Three different departments are taken: (1) the General Administration, (2) Police, (3) Education.

(1) *General Administration*

		Rs. per month.
Governor	..	10,000
Members of Council	..	5,333½
Commissioners of Division	..	3,000 to 3,500
Secretaries of Departments	..	3,000
Collectors and Magistrates	..	1,150 to 2,500
Asst. Collectors and Magistrates	..	450 to 1,600
Deputy Collectors and Magistrates	..	300 to 1,200
Head clerks	..	200 to 250
Clerks	..	30 to 200
Servants	..	20 to 24

(2) *Police*

		Rs. per month.
Inspector General	..	3000
Deputy Inspector General	..	1750 to 2150
Divisional Superintendents	..	600 to 1450
Assistant Superintendents	..	325 to 675

56. All this information has been adopted from the first part of D. R. Gadgil's admirable study of "*Salaries of Public Officials in India*."

57. D. R. GADGIL—*Salaries of Public Owcials in India*, pp. 19-20.

58. Ibid, Table II, p. 50.

		Rs. per month.
Inspectors	..	180 to 400
Sub-Inspectors	..	75 to 160
European Sergeants	..	150 to 200
Head Constables	..	28 to 50
Constables	..	20 to 24

(3) *Education*

Inspectorate:		
Director of Public Instruction	..	3000
Inspectors	..	1300 to 1500
Deputy Inspectors	..	250 to 800
Asst. Inspectors	..	50 to 300
Teaching:		
Principals and Professors (I.E.S. Select. grade)	..	1350 to 1750
Professors, etc., B.E.S. I	..	320 to 1200
Professors, etc., B.E.S. II	..	250 to 800
Assistant Masters (higher grade)	..	200 to 300
Ordinary graduate assistants	..	70 to 200
Ordinary undergraduate assistants		
Primary School Teachers (permanent qualified)	..	40 to 150
Primary School Teachers (unqualified)	..	20 to 60
		15

These facts and figures[59] thus indicate how very marked the grades are. The relationship between the earnings of services and labourers will be studied later. The figures given above bring out the remuneration paid to the various grades. Similarly the fact of hierarchical grading is brought to our notice. It is a matter of fact that the highest government officials stand at the top in the social scale.

Now we consider the earnings of those employed in Local Authorities such as Municipalities. A study of the frequency distribution of earnings of six Municipalities made by Dr. Rao[60] brings home the fact of the general low level of their earnings.

Monthly Income Grade		Percentage in each class to total number .
Below Rs. 10	..	19.1
Between Rs. 11 and Rs. 20	..	41.5
" " 21 " " 30	..	17,5
" " 31 " " 40	..	8.8
" " 41 " " 50	..	5.5
" " 51 " " 60	..	3.0
" " 61 " " 83	..	2.5
Above Rs. 83	.. ..	2.5

Thus more than 60 per cent of the total employees of these six Municipalities had a monthly income of less than Rs. 21. Those who had

59. All the figures from *"Salaries of Public Officials in India"* by D. R. GADGIL, p.86.
60. RAO, V.R.R.V.—*The National Income of British India*, 1931-32, Footnote 1, p. 158.

to pay income-tax were hardly 2.5% of the total number of employees. The fact of the general low level of the earnings of Municipal employees is more than proved. Municipal employees stand quite distinctly lower than the Government employees in the social scale.

The earnings of domestic servants are obviously low. The very fact that none of them is an income-tax payer speaks volumes for the general low level of their earnings. Of the 1,861,000 domestic servants studied by Dr. Rao, not even one earned Rs. 1000 per year.[61] All of them earned below Rs. 1000 per year. Their average income works at Rs. 161 a year. But as rightly pointed out by Dr. RAO, this may be a slight over-estimate as most of the forms were filled by the members of the upper-middle class, who employed chauffeurs and cooks who represented the highest class both economically and socially among the domestic servants. Thus he advises a scaling down of this average by 10 per cent to obtain a truer average, which works at Rs. 145 per year.[62] We can very well imagine the social position of domestic servants. They definitely stand very low in spite of the fact that in many cases they enjoy the confidence of the master. It would not be wrong to say that in some cases the domestic servants are treated worse than animals and bird pets by the masters and especially by the mistresses. It shows how degraded their position could be.

As very clearly stated in the introductory chapter we are interested in the study of the interrelation between emoluments and social position. That means our interest lies mainly in studying earned incomes. To this extent our study is limited. The earnings of the professionals, public officials and servants do not constitute the income from rent, profit and interest. They are primarily earned incomes.

As we proceed to the study of earnings and the corresponding social position of the earners in trade, transport, industry and agriculture, we must exclude the income from rent, profit and interest and strictly consider only earned incomes. The figures of the proportion of the collections of income tax as from the various sources given below make the point very clear. Thus for the year 1926-27 the proportion of the income-tax contributed by each source was following:—[63]

Income from salaries	..	22.0	per cent
,, ,, interest on securities	..	5.6	,, ,,
,, ,, business	..	61.6	,, ,,
,, ,, profession	..	2.3	,, ,,
,, ,, other sources	..	3.3	,, ,,

In the study of incomes of professions and public officials and servants, the criterion of income-tax proved very helpful to us to gauge adequately the economic as well as the social position of those concerned. There we could use the criterion because the incomes of both the income-tax payers as well as of those whose incomes were below the income-tax level were essentially earned incomes. We cannot adopt the same criterion in the case of Industry, Trade and Transport, not to mention agriculture (for there is no income-tax on income from land) for the simple reason that in the case of higher incomes accruing from these sources there always

61. Ibid, p. 130.
62. Ibid, pp. 173-74.
63. RAO, V.K.R.V.—*Taxation of Income in India*, p. 316.

creeps in the element of rent, profit and interest. To put it briefly those incomes are not purely earned incomes and have in them quite an element or unearned incomes. Hence we have to drop that criterion as useless for our purpose. However, the figures of the proportion between income-tax payers and those below the income-tax level give us a negative clue. Thus in Industry, as Dr. RAO tells us, 368,000 earners were income-tax payers from a total number of earners 14, 224, 000. Hardly 2.5 per cent of the total earners paid income tax. In trade and transport other than railways, posts and telegraphs, which are owned and managed by the Government there were 368, 000 earners who paid income-tax out of a total number of 6,086,000.[64] The percentage of income-tax payers to the total works at about 6.8. But in these cases as mentioned above there is an element of rent, profit and interest. We can safely proceed to consider incomes below the income-tax level as this forms the majority. More,-over, we have already considered the higher incomes arising from transport under services of Government railways.

Another difficulty crops up immediately, namely that of classifying the artisan class. The traditional classification of Industry and Agriculture does not conform to reality. For even in urban areas there are independent artisans who cannot be classed logically under Industry. So also in the rural areas there are artisans who cannot strictly be classed as agricultural labourers. Hence we propose to deal with the artisans separately. It is convenient to deal with trade and transport and then proceed to industry, artisans and agriculture.

As regards the earnings of trade, no detailed figures are given. One thing is, however, certain namely that the traders who earn below Rs, 1000 per year are definitely a small fry. Most of them flourish in the towns and rural areas rather than in the cities. The average income of this class must have been about Rs. 300 in the case of trader in a town and Rs. 200 in that of trader in villages.[65] As far as their social position is concerned they are treated as the lower middle class. They are, however, rated higher than the industrial workers chiefly for their independence.

Earners in transport other than the railway, posts and telegraph, had both skilled as well as unskilled operators. Their average income could not have been more than Rs. 256[66] per year. As for their social position is concerned, we can safely say that it is low. We know how motor drivers, gharry drivers, and rowers are rated as socially very low. They are distinctly much lower than the small traders. These transport workers have neither position nor money. As such their condition is pitiable. We can very well visualise the degraded position occupied by them from the way they are slandered.

The earners in industry present such a variety that we cannot class them under such a broad category. There are highly skilled workers as well as semi-skilled workers and unskilled workers. Then there are those who work in perennial factories and those who work in seasonal factories. Then there are workers in mines.

64. Ibid, p. 130.
65. Ibid, pp. 164-65.
66. Ref. V.K.R.V. RAO—Op, Cit, p. 167.

We start with the earnings of operatives in textile mills. More than two-thirds of the operatives of British India were working in the Bombay Presidency. As such a study of the earnings of mill operatives in the Bombay Presidency would give us an idea of the general level of earnings in the textile mill industry. Thus in 1924 the monthly average earnings of all workers (men only) in Bombay was Rs. 37-10-2. The figure for Sholapur was Rs. 23-15-6.[67] Skill was recognised and valued in the shape of higher payment. Thus in Bombay weavers who plied 4 looms were paid Rs. 2-14-2 per day; those who plied 3 looms Rs. 2-8-6 per day; and those who plied 2 looms Rs. 1-13-4 per day. Doffers were paid only 12 annas 1 p. per day. In the Madras presidency the wages for weavers were about Re. 1 per day and for male spinners about 10 annas per day. In the U.P. the average monthly wages of weavers were Rs. 33 and those of male spinners were Rs. 25.[68]

In the Jute mills in Bengal the average weekly earnings of workers in the various branches were as follows in 1929. Those who worked for 5½ days in a week were naturally paid higher than those who worked for 5 days or 4 days.

The earnings of those who worked for 5½ days in a week are as follows[69] :—

Workers in	Sacking weaving	..	Rs. 9- 8-0 per week.
,, ,,	Hessian weaving	..	Rs. 8- 4-6 ,, ,,
,, ,,	Sacking winding	..	Rs. 5-12-0 ,, ,,
,, ,,	Hessian winding	..	Rs. 5-12-0 ,, ,,
,, ,,	Sacking spinning	..	Rs. 4- 2-0 ,, ,,
,, ,,	Hessian spinning	..	Rs. 4- 2-0 ,, ,,
,, ,,	Batching	..	Rs. 4- 5-3 ,, ,,

The information on earnings in engineering and metal industries is given below. There is no uniformity about earnings even in the same occupation. Five typical occupations in the industry—masons, blacksmiths, turners, fitters and carpenters—are considered. As far as these occupations are considered the earnings in Bombay City and in Ahmedabad were the highest. These masons may earn from Rs. 50 to Rs. 70 a month; carpenters and blacksmiths from Rs. 60 to Rs. 75; and fitters and turners between Rs. 65 and Rs. 80.[70] Elsewhere the rates are lower One thing stands out clearly and that is differences in earnings depended on skill.

Earnings in Seasonal Factories : of the seasonal factories, cotton ginning and pressing are regarded as the most important. As such the wages in these two are considered. In Madras the rates for 1928 were :

Ginning	..	Re. 0- 7-0	per day (for males)
Pressing	..	0-11-0	,, ,, (,, ,,)

and the average for the whole presidency was : Ginning, 8 annas per day and Pressing, 9 As. 6 ps. per day (of course for males).[71]

67. *Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India*, p. 197.
68. Ibid, p. 198.
69. Ibid, p. 199.
70. Ibid, p. 199.
71. Ibid, p. 200.

The earnings in mines were differentiated on the basis of the nature of work. Those who worked underground were naturally paid slightly more than those who worked on the surface. The average earning was not more than 11 As. a day.

The dock labourers who do not possess much skill earned between Re. 0-14-0 to Rs. 1-8-0 per day. The rate of wages of unskilled industrial labourers was Rs. 15[72] per month in most of the provinces. Socially these labourers are of no account whatsoever.

The general impression created by a review of the various wage rates is that skill is well paid for.

According to the inquiry instituted by Dr. RAO the average wages in various industries for the year 1931-32 were as follows[73] :—

Textiles	..	Rs. 233 a year
Engineering	..	Rs. 431 ,, ,,
Minerals and Metals	..	Rs. 485 ,, ,,
Food, Drink & Tobacco	..	Rs. 105 ,, ,,
Chemicals, dyes, etc.	..	Rs. 235 ,, ,,
Paper & Printing	..	Rs. 375 ,, ,,
Processes relating to wood, stone and glass	..	Rs. 223 ,, ,,
Gins and presses	..	Rs. 114 ,, ,,

These figures give us a clear idea as to the level of earnings.

The elaborate enquiries made by the Labour Office, Government of Bombay, into the wages and earnings in various industries, which included both perennial and seasonal factories for the year 1934 give us excellent information about the nature of operations whether skilled or unskilled, rates of emoluments and whether they were in conformity with the skill displayed.

In the Engineering industry in the Bombay Presidency, over 46 per cent of the total number of workpeople employed were employed in railway and tramway workshops and in railway running sheds. About 12 per cent were employed in dock-yards and about 8 per cent in "general engineering."[74]

Almost all the factories and workshops appoint subordinate supervisory staff to ensure efficient production. We shall start with such people. This subordinate supervisory staff is divided into chargemen, maistrees and muccadems. Most of them are paid monthly. Taking the presidency as a whole, chargemen got Rs. 195-3-10 per month ; maistrees got Rs. 106-10-5 per month; and muccadams Rs. 36-8-7 per month. The scales of wages explain their position. Muccadams are paid so low for they are mainly "the headmen of gangs of unskilled labour".[75] Similarly all persons employed in engine and boiler rooms are on monthly rates of wages. Taking the presidency as a whole, steam engine drivers got Rs. 48-10-11 per month ; First Class Boiler attendants, Rs. 72-8 ; Second Class Boiler attendants, Rs. 50/- ; Engine and Boiler cleaners, Rs.

72. Ibid, p.
73. RAO, V.K.R.V.—*National Income of British India*, 1931-32, p. 140.
74. *"General Wage Census, Part I Perennial Factories—First Report"*, GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY, p. 18.
75. Ibid, p. 72.

19-13-5 ; Firemen Rs. 31-6-0 per month.[76] These figures of wages more than bring out the position, economic and social occupied by these employees.

In all the occupations a difference can be clearly seen between the remuneration of the skilled workers and ordinary workers. Thus in Bombay City a superior switchboard attendant was paid Rs. 4-4-2 per day, an ordinary switchboard attendant only Rs. 2-10-4 per day. All-round electrician being useful generally was paid Rs. 3-4-7 per day.[77] Similarly, blacksmiths were divided into superior and ordinary. The first were paid Rs. 2-12-3 per day while the latter were paid only Rs. 1-7-1 per day.[78] In the moulding department gradations were made. Superior moulders were paid Rs. 2-12-7 per day; Pattern-makers Rs. 2-8-10 per day; and ordinary moulders, Rs. 1-5-0 per day.[79] Likewise distinction was made between fitters and machinists dividing them according to their skill into special, superior and ordinary. The average daily wages for the presidency of special fitters was Rs. 4-11-9; superior fitters, Rs. 2-12-11; ordinary, Rs. 1-7-9. The corresponding daily wages for special machinists, Rs. 4-7-2; superior, Rs. 2-11-4; ordinary, Rs. 1-7-5.[80] Carpenters were divided into superior and ordinary, the former getting Rs. 2-10-7 per day and the latter Rs. 1-7-8. So also painters were divided, the superior getting Rs. 2-10-11 per day and ordinary Rs. 1-6-10 per day.[81]

The same principle was applied to occupations in the motor repair shops and motor transport. Superior motor mechanics got Rs. 2-10-4 per day while ordinary motor mechanics got Rs. 1-2-9 per day. Motor and lorry drivers got Rs. 58-2-1 per month while motor and lorry cleaners got only Rs. 23-2-0 per month.

Then there are many semi-skilled and unskilled workers such as mechanics' assistants, nawghanies (trained lifters) and unskilled workers. Mechanics' Assistants got on the average Re. 0-14-0 per day; Nawghanies (trained lifters) Rs. 1-1-0 per day; and unskilled workers 8 annas 7 pies per day.[82]

In the Watch and Ward Departments Jamadars or Head watchmen were naturally paid more than watchmen. Thus the former got Rs. 30-4-5 per month, while the latter got Rs. 20-4-4 per month. Sweepers got Rs. 17-1-3 per month.[83] They were the lowest paid and ranked lowest too. The remunerations paid were strictly according to skill.

In the printing industry also the supervisory staff was quite well paid. The following figures make it quite clear. Thus for the Bombay Presidency as a whole the average monthly earnings of Head Overseers was Rs. 201-5-6. This was obviously due to the technical skill possessed by them. Their income was above the income-tax level. Overseers got on an average Rs. 86-14-4 per month. What a difference between their remuneration and that of head overseers! Then Foremen printers got

76. Ibid, p. 73.
77. Ibid, p. 75.
78. Ibid, p. 76.
79. Ibid, p. 77.
80. Ibid, p. 79.
81. Ibid, p. 82.
82. Ibid, p. 86.
83. Ibid, p. 86.

on an average Rs. 152-3-11 per month. Their income was obviously above the income-tax level. This rate reflects their skill. Compositor foremen got on an average Rs. 72-6-11 per month; while binding foremen got Rs. 56-13-11 per month.[84] So much for the earnings of subordinate supervisory staff.

Reporters and translators got on an average Rs. 110-4-3 per month. Thus their income was also above the income-tax level. Their higher earning can be explained by the standard of education and learning required of them. Socially, they are classed as belonging to the same strata as the majority of Government servants, i.e. mostly clerks. Proof-readers got on an average Rs. 57-10-4 per month. Copy-holders got only Rs. 30-1-4 per month.[85]

In the composing departments, compositors earned on an average Rs. 34-0-6 per month. Impositors and imposers got Rs. 40-10-2 per month. Distributors got Rs. 20-1-0 per month.[86]

In ordinary occupations in printing departments earnings were naturally lower. Thus hand pressmen got on an average Rs. 27-15-0 per month. Treadle machinemen got Rs. 30-8-5 per month. Letter press machinemen got Rs. 43-7-0 per month. Letter press feeders got Rs. 18-13-9 per month. Ballers got Rs. 19-12-6 per month.[87]

Even in the printing industry the services of fitters, wiremen, carpenters, are required. Here also a distinction is made between superior and ordinary workmanship. Thus the average monthly earnings of superior fitters were Rs. 73-10-6, while that of the average monthly earnings of ordinary fitters were Rs. 32-11-2 only. Similarly, superior carpenters got Rs. 58-2-9 per month, while ordinary carpenters got only Rs. 36-0-1 per month. Skill is recognised and valued thus. Motor and lorry drivers in the industry got Rs. 38 per month. Watchmen got only Rs. 24-14-3 per month.[88]

In the cotton textile industry the earnings of supervisory staff was more than that of weavers or spinners. Responsibility meant more remuneration. Taking the presidency as a whole Head Jobbers on the spinning side earned Rs. 83-7-5 according to time rate and Rs. 112-5-11 according to piece rates. Head Jobbers on the weaving side earned Rs. 124-3-1 according to time rates and Rs. 139-7-11 according to piece rates.[89] Fancy Jobbers earned on an average Rs. 46-14-5 per month according to time rates and Rs. 69-6-0 per month according to piece rates. Jobbers on the spinning side earned on an average Rs. 41-9-8 per month. according to time rates and Rs. 51-9-10 according to piece rates. On the weaving side they earned Rs. 48-7-4 and Rs. 91-0-8 respectively.[90] In the Mule Spinning Department spinners got on an average Rs. 1-4-5 per day

84. *Labour Office, Government of Bombay—"General Wage Census" Part I, Perennial Factories*, 2nd Report, p. 40.
85. Ibid, p. 41.
86. Ibid, p. 42.
87. Ibid, p. 43.
88. Ibid, p. 48.
89. *Labour Office, Government of Bombay—General Wage Census, Part I, Perennial Factories, Third Report*, p. 87.
90. Ibid, p. 88.

according to time rates and Rs. 1-10-2 per day according to piece rate.[91] In the weaving department one loom weavers earned on an average Rs. 1-7-1 per day.[92] Automatic loom weavers earned Rs. 2-8-11 per day on time rates.[93] Here also electricians and fitters, machinists etc. were well paid. Thus electric motormen on an average earned Rs. 1-0-9 per day. Switchboard assistants earned on an average Rs. 2-2-8 per day. Superior wiremen earned Rs. 2-7-0 per day, while ordinary wiremen earned Rs. 1-7-0 per day.[94] Here also fitters were divided into special, superior and ordinary. Special fitters earned on an average Rs. 4-13-2 per day; superior fitters, Rs. 2-8-4 per day; and ordinary fitters Rs. 1-7-2 per day. Likewise machinists were divided into special, superior and ordinary. Special machinists earned Rs. 4-8-2 per day; superior machinists Rs. 2-6-10 per day; and ordinary machinists, Rs. 1-7-6[95] per day. The average earnings of coolies and sweepers was 11 annas 2 pies and 9 annas 1 pie respectively.[96] Thus we have a systematic gradation economic and social in the cotton textile industry. We know that the industry is very important. We get a good idea as to the position of industrial workers from this study.

Even if we take smaller industries like oils and soaps or watch manufacturing, distilleries, gold-thread making etc. we find that superior talent is recognised and well paid for. Thus it is a common principle that skill is recognized and valued.

Now we turn to consider the position of those working in seasonal industries. By its very nature a seasonal industry works for a part of the year. This reflects on the nature of the staff employed, namely that quite a proportion of the staff is maintained on a temporary basis. Then again such temporary staff must be reverting to agricultural pursuits during unemployment. Such industries thrive both in urban as well as rural areas, unlike the perennial ones. We consider below ginning factories, pressing factories and Gur factories. The term factory is used in a special and restricted sense, namely to denote "those places mainly employing power machinery, open for a part of the year only, and concerned for the most part with the handling of a particular crop as it becomes available."[97]

In the ginning factories about 25 per cent of the workers belong to the clerical, supervisory, engineering and watch and ward staffs while the rest are purely manual workers.[98] All the manual workers are employed on a temporary basis while more than 90 per cent of the engineering staff is also employed on a temporary basis.[99] It will be seen how the rates of wages differ according to the location of the factory in all cases. Thus manager in urban factory gets Rs. 54-8-10 per month,

91. Ibid, p. 104.
92. Ibid, p. 115.
93. Ibid, p. 117.
94. Ibid, p. 123.
95. Ibid, p. 124.
96. Ibid, p. 126.
97. *Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India*, p. 75.
98. *Labour Office, Government of Bombay—General Wage Census, Part II, Seasonal Factories*, p. 20.
99. Ibid, p. 20.

while manager in rural factory gets Rs. 45-5-8 per month. Engineer in urban factory gets Rs. 89-9-7 per month, while engineer in rural factory gets Rs. 72-6-0 per month. So also clerk in urban factory gets Rs. 24-12-10 per month, while clerk in rural factory gets Rs. 22-13-7 per month.[100] Fitter in urban factory gets Rs. 41-9-11 per month, while fitter in rural factory gets Rs. 37-2-1 per month. So also carpenter in urban factory gets Rs. 37-1-9 per month while carpenter in rural factory gets Rs. 29-7-6 per month.[101] Even watchmen in urban factories earned more than those in rural factories. Thus the former earned Rs. 15-15-6 per month while the latter earned Rs. 14-15-6 per month.[102] Thus a systematic distinction can be seen.

In pressing factories quite a large percentage of total workers was employed on a temporary basis. Only 3.76 per cent of them were employed on a permanent basis.[103] Here also a distinction was made between the earnings of urban and rural workers. Thus urban manager got Rs. 54-10-8 per month, while rural manager got Rs. 34-0-0 per month. Urban engineer got Rs. 55-0-0 per month, while rural engineer got Rs. 49-14-8 per month. Urban clerk got Rs. 23-0-0 per month, while rural clerk got Rs. 20-14-4 per month.[104] Urban engine-driver got Rs. 30-12-0 per month, while rural got Rs. 29-10-0 per month.[105] Urban watchman got Rs. 15-0-11 per month, while rural got Rs. 14-10-7 per month.[106]

In Gur factories only two occupations require skill, those of engine-driver and oiler. The rest of the workers are just coolies, without any skill. They revert to agriculture when the factories close down. Very little clerical and supervisory staff is required. Workpeople constitute 88.43 per cent of the total staff. A peculiarity to be noted is that here rural staff is paid slightly more than semi-urban staff. Thus a semi-urban engine driver got Rs. 24-8-0 p.m. while rural engine driver got Rs. 31-4-4 p.m. Semi-urban oilman got Rs. 10-12-10 p.m. while rural oilman got Rs. 12-0-8 per month.[107]

The earnings of workers employed in seasonal factories have been distinctly lower than those of industrial workers proper. Now as we consider the earnings and position of artisans, we shall see how their earnings are lower still. Amongst artisans we must recognise two clasess—urban and rural. As representative of the urban class we consider the earnings of washermen and barbers. In Madras the net monthly earnings of 24 washermen, selected as samples was Rs. 394 which comes to about Rs. 17 per head. The net income of 23 barbars, selected as samples, was Rs. 424, i.e. about Rs. 18 per head.[108] As far as village artisans are considered, if they are lumped together with goldsmith, the aristocrat of the artisans, the average annual income of village artisans

100. Ibid, p. 26.
101. Ibid, p. 27.
102. Ibid, p. 29.
103. Ibid, p. 48.
104. Ibid, p. 53.
105. Ibid, p. 54.
106. Ibid, p. 55.
107. Ibid, p. 70.
108. RAO, Dr. V.K.R.V.—*The National Income of British India*, 1931-32; pp. 146-47.

works at ranging between Rs. 100 and Rs. 180/- in 1931.[109] We reproduce below the table of the earnings of village artisans given by Dr. RAO.[110]

TABLE 40

Estimated Annual Earnings of Village Artisans

Occupation	United Province				Karnatak
	Village Bhanuma Dist. Buland shahr	Village Gopalpur, Dist. Bareilly	Village Dhara-Buzarg, Dist. Gorakhpur	Village Shyam Dharma, Dist. Gorakhpur	Village Heasarur, Dist. Dharwar.
Blacksmith	76	—	120	367	78
Barber	151	64	45	101	90
Priest	98	59	—	181	—
Carpenter	137	112	—	—	133
Potter	99	—	—	—	—
Tailor	185	—	165	125	100
Cobbler	96	—	—	—	—
Washerman	—	24	—	—	—
Goldsmith	—	—	265	214	—

The table above brings out the economic position of the artisans. Socially they stand low in the scale. Goldsmith is well thought of mainly because of his connection with the rich classes. The rest of the artisans are of no great consideration. The Priest should by his position stand above the artisans class.

Agriculture : Earlier we have had occasion to note how seventy per cent of the total population, which depends on agriculture, gets only 52 per cent of the national income. Then again we have seen how even the share of the national income was far from equally distributed. The size of holdings brings out that fact. Now we analyse the population which returns agriculture as it's main occupation. The total population of persons who declare agriculture as their main occupation is 66.2 millions. On further analysis we find that of this (66.2 million) as many as 2.3 millions are non-cultivating owners. Estate agents, managers of owners, rent collectors, clerks, etc. total 0.2 millions. Cultivating owners form 18.2 millions. Tenant cultivators total 23.6 millions. Nomadic cultivators 0.6 millions and agricultural labourers 20.2 millions.[111] Obviously enough, we are interested in the earnings of the tenant cultivators, nomadic cultivators and agricultural labourers. According to Dr. RAO the annual income of agricultural worker was Rs. 90 in 1931.[112]

It will be instructive to study the figures of agricultural wages in the Bombay Presidency in 1922. Though the figures relate to a particular area and for past years they give us a clear idea about the economic position. Findlay G. SHIRRAS, Director of the Enquiry into Agricultural Wages in the Bombay Presidency, classifies the agricultural labourers

109. Ibid, p. 152.
110. Ibid, p. 152.
111. Ibid, p. 81 (footnote).
112. Ibid, p. 82.

first into urban and rural and then into field labourers, ordinary labourers and skilled labourers. According to him "skilled labourers may be taken to include (1) the village carpenter, blacksmith, mason, or leather-worker in the reporting centre where the records are kept; and (2) in the case of district headquarters towns, sometimes the urban artisan who is not an agricultural wage earner in the sense in which the village artisan is."[113] We have already dealt with this type of worker, while discussing the artisan class. Strictly speaking the skilled labourers should not be included in agricultural labour. Labourers who actually till the field or work to build embankments and gutters etc., to the fields should be considered. The field labourers and ordinary labourers as defined by Mr. SHIRRAS, thus constitute the real agricultural labour class. In urban areas, taking the presidency as a whole, the average daily wage of field labourers was 9 annas in 1922; that of ordinary labourer was 12 annas.[114] In rural areas, the average daily wage of field labourers was 7 annas 3 pies in 1922; that of ordinary labourers, 7 annas 9 pies.[115] An interesting feature of this is that ordinary labourers were slightly better paid than field labourers. Anyway the earnings of agricultural labourer are much lower than that of industrial labourer. Socially he is considered as degraded. This must have been due to the element of serfdom in the relations between him and the landlord. In many cases the relations between landlords and peasants are far from free. Now we proceed to study those who are as good or as bad as serfs.

Thus we come to study the earnings on plantations, where labour is far from free. A brief description of Plantations will be instructive. "The plantation represents the development of the agricultural resources of tropical countries in accordance with the methods of Western industrialism; it is a large scale enterprise in agriculture. The plantation system connotes the acquisition of a limited but fairly extensive area for the cultivation of a particular crop, the actual cultivation being done under the direct supervision of a manager, who in some cases may himself be the actual proprietor. About 90% of the plantations in North India and nearly all those in Madras and Burma are controlled and managed by Europeans."[116] This fact very well explains exploitation. The worker is not free to leave plantation without the permission of his master.

In the Assam tea gardens the wages of workers are mostly on piece rates. The workers are under the supervision of Sardars, who are what Jóbbers are in mills. The daily wage of a worker is usually 4 annas. It is customary to give free housing, medical facilities, ground for grazing his cattle, etc. to the workers. The average monthly earnings of workers in the Assam Valley in 1929-30 was Rs. 13-8-7.[117] In the Burma Valley it was Rs. 10-11-0.[118] In the Dooars the average monthly

113. *Labour Office, Government of Bombay—Report on an Enquiry into Agricultural Wages in the Bombay Presidency*, p. 4.
114. Ibid, pp. 13-14.
115. Ibid, p. 17.
116. *Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India*, p. 349.
117. Ibid, p. 387.
118. Ibid, p. 387.

earnings of workers was Rs. 14-4-1.[119] In the South, in the Madras Presidency the prevailing basic rates of wages was 7 as. a day, provided the worker toiled from 7-30 A.M. to 4-30 P.M.[120]

The absolutely wretched economic condition of these workers very easily explains their degraded social position. In many instances they are not even treated as human beings. Economic condition acts and reacts on social position.

III

Indian social organization has been worked upon by various influences such as the Islamic rule and the British rule. Actually we have reached a stage when we may be said to have an altogether new civilization. Yet the effects of earlier influences are clearly visible. But those influences have been so very well assimilated, that we are having a new civilization.

And we say so on good grounds. Hindu civilization, we have seen, could never become completely national. The peculiar caste system entailed a class civilization and such was the cause of the failure to enlist the sympathy of the entire mass of people. Then Muslim civilization could not also be national effectively though of course it gave us some sense of unity. This was the result of the basic differences between the two systems. Moreover, the presence of a third party namely the British, did not allow the development of a perfect understanding and unity arising therefrom between the two communities. So also the British influence has not been able to replace the entire system. We have inculcated many points from the British. Thus the development of rationality, secularism, ideas of democracy, etc. should be acknowledged as the result of British rule. "The growth of Indian nationalism is, in fact the growth of the increasingly integrating conscious struggle of the progressive forces within the new Indian society which came into existence during the British period, against the restrictions placed upon their free economic, social, political and cultural development, as also of the Indian society as a whole, by the British Government supported by native reactionary forces like princes, landlords, communalists and others."[121]

Yet we know how the British power has been instrumental in keeping us industrially and economically and politically backward. Many are the failings of British rule. And our aspirations to create a millenium, a new civilization, springs from these very failings. Thus we synthesize the various influences and try to build a new structure. We hope to make the new structure free from the earlier defects. Thus we strive to combine the Eastern Philosophy with Western Science.

In the light of the survey we should like to examine the thesis, which is repeated *ad nauseum*, that India has spiritual attitude towards life and as such does not bother about the worldly economic problem. India has been, as we know, subject to diverse influences of Hinduism, Budhism, Islam, Western commerce etc. It is long since India has been

119. Ibid, p. 399.
120. Ibid, p. 400.
121. A. R. DESAI,—*Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, p. 272.

open to external influences. With the development of commerce and trade with the world at large, Indian society ceased to be 'closed'. The active participation in trade and commerce gives a lie to the thesis. There is, however, a strong reason for the propounding of the thesis. That is due to the overemphasis laid on the religious aspects of our culture. It is a commonplace of history that the impact of Western competition, especially since the British domination, hit our economy very hard. There was no opportunity for our traders, artisans and producers. The economic growth was stunted. As a natural reaction to this people came to have faith in the law of destiny. This attitude was born out of helplessness. It was not a genuine spiritual attitude. To use Sorokin's terminology we can call the Indian culture as *"Pseudo Ideational Culture."* SOROKIN aptly describes the mentality of Pseudo Ideational Culture thus: "Of all types of mentality existent among the poor and disenfranchised classes the pseudo-ideational type is the most persistent ; it is less frequent among the rich and privileged."[122] Does not this description fit in with the crippled Indian society ? Most certainly it does. We know that the peculiar attitude was born out of despair. Rationalist and materialist philosophical ideas have been slowly spreading, however, in India during the last twenty years."[123] Secondly the economic development which has taken place in India does not in any way warrant that it is altogether of a different type than that to be seen in the rest of the world. It is of course admitted that economic development has been very slow, dreadfully slow, due to various reasons, chief among them being foreign domination. Our economy had always to toe with the British economic policy. Nonetheless economic development did take place. Rightly does D. R. GADGIL remark that "it is easy to see that there are no novel features in the evolution of industrial organisation. The same features have always been noticed in a similar transitional stage in other countries. This merely emphasizes the belief that there is nothing to warrant the contention, frequently made, that the Indian economic structure is the only one of its kind and outside the pale of ordinary economic laws."[124] We need no other authority.

122. P. SOROKIN—*Social and Cultural Dynamics*, Vol. I, p. 108.
123. A. R. DESAI—*Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, p. 272.
124. D. R. GADGIL—*The Industrial Evolution of India*, p. 196.

CHAPTER VI

STUDY OF SOCIETY IN THE U.S.S.R.—A PLANNED SOCIETY,

Plan of The Chapter :

(I) Background of the Revolution of 1917.

(II) Establishment of Soviet communistic Rule. And the change worked by the same in the entire socio-economic set-up.

(III) The working of the Five Year Plans and their repurcussions on the body socio-economic of Soviet society. Differences in income and social status.

(IV) Could Planning abolish differences in Social and Economic positions as well as fundamentally alter the close relationship between the two ?

I

The revolution of 1917 was not a sudden outburst as it might appear. As we consider the conditions in Russia prior to the revolution, we can easily understand how forces were at work which brought about destruction of the old regime and the system.

Russia, as we know was ruled by the Czars. The whole structure social, economic and political was pyramidal in shape. We can very well imagine how backward the country must have been in view of the fact that serfdom prevailed as late as 1861. In our study of the English society, we have noted how under feudalism the society was economically and industrially backward. Capitalism had not developed in Russia. More than eighty per cent of the population lived in villages.[1] It is interesting to note that though serfdom had been abolished by 1861, the peasant remained psychologically a serf for a very long time.[2] Moreover his economic condition was so bad that he was compelled to remain servile to his landlord.

The crushing defeat of Russia in the Crimean War (1855-56) brought about the abolition of serfdom. This event had serious repurcussions on the nobility, which was composed entirely of landowners. The nobility entered on a period of economic decline. Here we recall to our mind a similar development in the English history after the introduction of commutation. As in England, the landowning nobility in Russia lost its place of pride after the emancipation of serfs in 1861. The place of nobility was gradually being taken up by the bourgeoisie, which comprised the beureacracy and merchants.[3]

The pace of industrialization was very slow, however. The Czars being desirous of wealth imported capitalism from abroad. We purposely use the term capitalism, for both capital as well as capitalisits were imported from abroad.[4] This effort to pump in capitalism proved very

1. DE BASILY—*"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, p. 26.
2. Ibid, p. 28.
3. Ibid, pp. 21-22.
4. cf. E. STRAUSS—*"Soviet Russia"*, pp. 15-16.

disastrous in the long run to the nation as a whole. The employment of foreign capital meant the going away of all profits to foreigners. Native industrialists could not come up in the face of complete foreign domination over industries. The bulk of the people were peasants. Due to the impact of industrialization handicrafts collapsed. This made the condition of the peasants all the more precarious. The peasants had perforce to seek employment in factories to earn their living. Moreover, even such employment was not always available. Because there was not much demand for the products of factories due to the impoverishment of the people at large. In short, it was a vicious circle par excellence.

This state of affairs goaded the peasants to rise in rebellion. The revolution of 1905—1906 was obviously the outcome of the aggravating economic situation. The defeat of Russia by Japan made matters still worse. The inefficient method of fighting the war made for loss of confidence in the administration on the part of the people. The czarist regime was hated. The rise of the proletariat made systematic organisation of opposition possible. This is not to deny the influence of socialist thinkers. The repurcussion had its reaction in kindling the revolutionary spirit. Democratic forces were organized in 1903. The agitations of these socialist groups culminated in the revolution of 1905-1906, after the disasters of Russo-Japanese war.[5]

The establishment of the Duma was the immediate outcome of the revolution of 1905-06. The Duma was a parliament. And it was composed of liberals. The Czar, however, dissolved it. Stolypin's unceasing efforts to improve the position of peasants met with partial success. People would not take lying down the act of dissolution of the first Duma. Naturally the second Duma had in it more revolutionary element. This Duma was also dissolved. After this disorder ensued in the country. The third Duma did some good work. This, coupled with good harvests brought prosperity to the nation. The middle class was rising. This class was composed of peasants. "By 1914 there was a new population of yeomanry, which has been reckoned as numbering at least one-tenth of the peasant population."[6] Things were being done smoothly when the first world war intervened.

The mismanagement of the war and the fact that the Czar was acting under sinister influences, coupled with the fact of soaring prices, suffering of the people was responsible for the fall of Czardom in 1917.

The revolutionary forces which were gathering were responsible for the revolution. There were two main socialist parties which came to be named as the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks. The latter were out and out Marxists. They were not content with mere improvements but insisted on the revolution to instal labour in power. The Bolsheviks were first in a minority. The collaboration between the two parties rendered easier the overthrow of the old regime.

The prerevolution Russian structure, social, political and economic was unbalanced. And hence its sudden collapse. The abolition of serfdom was unaccompanied by development of capitalism along proper lines. The importing of foreign copitalism had very disastrous effects. Certain anachronisms made matters worse. Thus the reliance by the Czar on

5. HECKER, J. F.—*"Russian Sociology"*, p. 44.
6. Bernard PARES—*"Russia"*, p. 88.

the old nobility despite its ineffectiveness proved injurious to the interests of the nation. The distance between the elite and the masses was so absolute as to create a feeling of aloofness amongst them. And this feeling of aloofness can be easily explained by the coincidence between the cultured, the privileged and, intellectual workers on the one hand and the uncultured, the unprivileged and manual workers on the other.[7] Further, the harsh treatment meted out to the elite on the eve of the revolution finds its explanation in the deep rooted estrangement between the elite and the masses.

II

The establishment of soviet communistic rule was not achieved smoothly. The adamantly foolish attitude of the autocracy was responsible for the revolutionary outburst.[8] It took, however, quite a long time before the final victory of the revolutionists became an established fact. There were two main socialist parties the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries. The Bolsheviks were bent on international revolution whereas the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries were satisfied with internal revolution. With the termination of the war (March 1918) the differences between the two parties became ever acute. The whole situation was such that it needed very strong leadership. And the Bolsheviks provided the country with that. Hence the ultimate triumph of the Bolsheviks.

The situation in the country was, however, very grave. The war had impoverished the country utterly. The ravages of inflation only aggravated the situation. Besides the assumption of control over factories and production was responsible for considerable loss. In the wave of enthusiasm the difference between the skilled and the unskilled workers was obliterated. Equal payment became the rule. Production was in doldrums. Money had lost importance. In fact the entire economy had broken down. This state of affairs was alarming enough. And there had to be a radical change in the policy. Lenin rose to the occasion and put a stop to the policy, which had such disastrous results. All this period is famously known as the period of War Communism or Militant Communism. Lenin admitted the defeat and ordered a partial retreat. The Bolshevik party was now styled as the Communist party, which controlled the entire administration. Naturally enough only those who were staunch supporters of the policy could be members of the party. The party had to take utmost precautions to see that the general policy would not be violated. To ensure this centralised control was exercised.

And it was this centralised control by the party which could make allowance for a partial retreat in order to attain ultimately the goal of establishing socialism. Lenin was the acclaimed leader of the party. The decision to adopt the New Economic Policy came in for much criticism. However, if we consider the following statement made by Lenin, we can very well understand how it was only a partial retreat and that too for the furtherance of the attainment of the ultimate goal. The statement was made at the Congress of the Communist Party in March

7. DE BASILY—*"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, p. 38.
8. Bernard PARES—*"Russia"*, p. 100.

1921. "On the economic front, in our attempt to pass over to Communism, we had suffered, by the spring of 1921, a more serious defeat than any previously inflicted on us.......... The New Economic Policy means the substitution of a food tax for requisitioning, it means a transition to the restoration of Capitalism to no small degree........ The fundamental question, from the point of view of strategy, is, who will the sooner take advantage of this new situation."[9] The adoption of the NEP was obviously a compromise. It had very important repurcussions on the body socio-economic. It should, however, be borne in mind that the very compromise was effected to facilitate the successful working of the plan of economic development of the union. Moreover the compromise related only to the economic aspects. The ideological stand taken by the party, namely that of proletarian control was not given up. The ideological basis was not tampered with. As we study the social and economic results of the same, it will become abundantly clear that the ideology was not abandoned.

Concessions were made to free enterprise. Only trade and handicrafts were made absolutely free. The main problem to be solved was the food-problem. Naturally, there had to be freeing of initiative of individual peasant holders. The principle of the ultimate state ownership of land was not discarded, however. The right to hire labour, agricultural machinery, to rent land was granted. This naturally created a division of the peasantry into groups according to wealth. After the Scissor's Crisis many concessions were made to peasants so that the agrarian prices were raised.[10] The middle peasants improved economically. The Kulaks became wealthier. And the labourer remained poor. The Kulaks dominated the village socially as well as economically, owing to their possession of tools and instruments of production, higher skill, unscrupulousness and luck.[11] They seized the golden opportunity provided them by the New Economic Policy.

As regards the freeing of initiative in industry, the policy was so designed as not to impair the development of the "State managed big and medium-sized industries".[12] Naturally, the scope for private enterprise was limited.

The New Economic Policy had important repercussions on the position occupied by labour. Equalitarianism in wages was immediately discarded. The trade-unions no longer retained absolute rights in the fixing of wages. It was replaced by free bargaining. Differentiation was made between the payment to skilled and unskilled labour. Regular grades were made. There were in all seventeen grades of workers recognized during 1921-22. The one in the seventeenth grade got eight times what one in the first grade got. Skilled worker was paid more than thrice as much as an unskilled worker. The only incentives to production were higher wages.[13] Social incentives failed to obtain. In short, personal betterment was the main motive which guided all activity.

9. BAYKOV, A.—*"The Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 48.
10. STRAUSS, E.—*"Soviet Russia"*, p. 142.
11. Ibid, p. 145.
12. Alexander BAYKOV—*"The Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 125.
13. Ibid, p. 145.

Now, all these facts seem to be exactly in contradiction to the idological stand taken by the Soviet State. As we proceed further, we can easily see that it was not so. Thus the freedom of enterprise in agriculture was effectively curtailed by levying a progressive tax on the incomes from this source. The percentage of small peasants exempted from paying the tax increased every year. In 1924-25, 20% of peasant households, in 1925-26, 25% and in 1927-28, 35% were exempted from paying tax.[14] At the same time wealthy Kulaks were made subject to heavy tax. Excess profits tax was introduced. In 1926-27, 11.3% of the peasantry (rural proletariat) paid no agricultural tax; 22.1% of poor peasants paid 1.3% of the total tax collected; 62.7% middle peasants paid 72.9% and 3.9% Kulaks paid 25.9% of the total sum collected in tax.[15] The poor peasants not only enjoyed tax rebates, but state help also in the case of crop failure. The peasants were encouraged to participate in the management of co-operative associations. The Kulaks were scarcely, if ever, admitted. As production increased, their power was effectively curbed. In fact as we shall see a little later, the very class was sought to be abolished altogether.

Similarly in industry, though the director of a factory was given maximum freedom as an executive, the whole atmosphere was full of suspicion about him. The party viewed with suspicion the activities of pre-revolutionary specialists. In these circumstances it was not possible for the administrative and technical staff to exert the managerial power, theoretically granted to them.[16] Moreover with increasing production, restrictions were growingly imposed on private enterprises.

As for labour, it was the avowed policy of the state to patronize lower type of labour as against the highly skilled. All sorts of facilities such as Scholarship for the education of children, cultural services etc. were granted to industrial workers. They were better off socially as well as economically, than before the revolution, and especially so when compared to other sections of society. The salaries of those employed in administrative and cultural institutions lagged noticeably behind. The salary of such workers was fixed as 75% of industrial worker's wages in 1928-29.[17] As far as the pay is concerned, the position of engineers, technicians and administrative personnel was better. Even then, their earnings were much slower to recover than those of industrial workers.[18] The industrial workers benefitted both materially as well as socially during the period of the New Economic policy. Thus they were "first-grade citizens, whilst engineers, technicians and managerial employees were in the same sense only second-grade citizens."[19] Considerable importance was attached to social origin and labour standing. In every field, those who came of the labouring class were given a marked preference over others. Higher staff was severly handicapped under such conditions. This had its inevitable effect on productivity.

14. Ibid, p. 92.
15. Ibid, f.n. p. 134.
16. Ibid, p. 117.
17. Ibid, p. 149.
18. Ibid, p. 149.
19. Ibid, p. 150.

All this was quite in keeping with the avowed ideology, namely that of creating a classless society, where the proletarians controlled production. It is very pertinent to ask here whether this policy itself did not amount to the creation of a class, which was invested with supreme power. We cannot be swayed by declarations. Neither should we be blind to the facts of the situation. The facts, as we have noted them, clearly testify to the working of a class system. We shall discuss this in greater detail at a later stage. Suffice it to say, however, that during this period the top-most position was occupied by the industrial workers. Even Maurice DOBB, who at one place complained of the difference between the pay given to specialists and 'Red Directors' who were promoted to the posts from among the workers, is constrained to admit that special favours were made to them.[20] DOBB remarks that "the social equality which is sensed in outward detail strikes deeper to an economic equality".[21] Thus the differences in the incomes of specialist and ordinary workers are sought to be nullified by steep progression in the income tax. It will not be wrong to maintain that where educational bodies, recruited eighty per cent of the students from the working class the bourgeoisie was being discriminated against. We have it of the same authority that "a distinctly harsh differentiation was practised until quite recently against students who came from bourgeois homes".[22] In another place the same author admits that "almost all the managers of factories to-day are promoted workers; as are most of the directorates of Trusts and the majority of the higher political and economic administration".[23] Under the circumstances, it would be sheer blindness to facts to assert the working of a classless system. The fact that majority of the population, namely the workers came to play a dominating role does not prevent us from labelling it as a class. It is not the quantity which is of relevant consideration in the determination of a class. The qualitative aspects such as authority, prestige and economic betterment matter. It would certainly be bad logic to say that simply because a class is composed of a majority of the people it ceases to be a class. The very fact that there was an important minority which was being systematically discriminated against in all fields of life testifies to the working of a class system. It is sheer twisting of the very concept of class to deny the working of a class-system under the conditions studied above. Mere inversion of the positions occupied by the various constituents of society does not mean the absence of the class-system. The communist Party, which controlled the state was composed entirely of workers. It was not possible to be admitted into the party without being a manual labourer or a peasant.[24]. Now, all this more than goes to prove the working of a class-system.

III

The soviet leaders have been proclaiming from the house-tops that the main goal is to create a classless society. In his address on the tenth

20. DOBB, Maurice—*"Russian Economic Development Since The Revolution"* p. 340.
21. Ibid, p. 374.
22. Ibid, p. 374.
23. M. DOBB—*"Soviet Russia And The World"*, pp. 112-113.
24. Cf. REPORT OF THE AMERICAN TRADE UNION DELEGATION: *"Russia After Ten Years"*, p. 72.

anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, Stalin reiterated the faith in the same doctrine. He points out the difference between revolutions in the past and the Bolshevik Revolution. "A revolution in the past generally ended by the replacement at the seat of administration of one group of exploiters by another group of exploiters.........The October revolution is different in principle from these revolutions. It sets as its goal not the replacement of form of exploitation by another form of exploitation, ...but the annihilation of every form of exploiting group, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat,......and the organisation of a new classless society".[25] The constitution of 1936, which is popularly known as Stalin constitution dissolved the former differentiation between the status of various political groups.[26] Nevertheless the leading role of the members of the Communist Party was recognised. And care is taken to enlist only faithful persons in the party. No oppotion is entertained. Only those who can fall in line with the party, stand chances of betterment. The oppositionists are deprived of all chances of betterment.

As we proceed to the study of the working of the Five Year Plans, it is very pertinent to discuss briefly the avowed aims and ideology behind planning. The New Economic Policy was, as already noted, a compromise solution to ensure better productivity. We have also noted how with every increase in production the activities of the NEP-men came to be effectively curbed. It must not be forgotton, that the fear of an attack by the capitalist world played a very important role in the guidance of planning. The point was emphatically stressed in the instructions adopted by the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Commission of he Communist Party in 1927. It runs as follows. "Taking into account the possibility of an armed attack by capitalist states on the first proletarian state in history, it is necessary in drafting the five-year-plan to devote the maximum attention to the speedy development of those branches in the national economy in general and industry in particular, which are most essential for ensuring the country's defences and economic stability in war time".[27] Only when we take into consideration this fact, will it be possible for us to understand properly the place of pride given to armed forces and those engaged in the production of essential articles and armaments in particular. This point is usually missed due to the propagation of the fable, as late as 1935, that in the U.S.S.R. "military expenditure constitutes only 10 per cent of the total State Budget".[28]

The ideology working behind planning is very simple, apparently. Put in simple terms the ideology is to create a classless society, where workers wield the control. It is not, however, so simple as that for various types of aims have to be attained such as the social, the economic, the political and the spiritual to ensure the realisation of the ideology. The WEBBS have made a very trenchent observation on the complexity involved. "It was the fate of Russia to have its religious, its industrial

25. CARR, E.H.—*"Soviet Impact On The Western World"*, p. 99.
26. Cf. Rudolf SCHLESINGER—*"Soviet Legal Theory"*, p. 200.
27. Alexander BAYKOV—*"Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 128.
28. DE BASILY—*"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, p. 308.

and its political revolutions, not separately, but almost simultaneously".[29] The economic aim has been to achieve abundance. The political aim has been to transfer power to the masses. Proletarian dictatorship was the watchword. Attainment of social justice has been the avowed Soviet aim. Absolute equality of treatment to human beings has been the spiritual aim.[30] And all these aims were to be attained in consistency with the accepted fundamental ideology. Naturally, planning could not be restricted to the economic aspects. An all-sided view of planning had to be taken. Accordingly soviet planning could not be restricted mainly to the economic problems; "it was concerned equally, if not more, with wider issues concerning those social relationships which compose the basic texture of society".[31]

The equalitarian tendency operating in the payment of wages, on the eve of planning, can be very well understood in the light of the aforesaid. It has been conclusively proved that the inequality in wages had definitely been reduced. Abram BERGSON, after carefully studying the quartile ratios of wages frequency distributions of workers in eight important industries for the year 1914 and 1928, remarks that "the conclusion is inescapable that the variation or inequality of wages among industrial workers was less in the Soviet Union in 1928 than in Russia in 1914".[32] Thus the upper 20 per cent of the wage earners received 44.0 per cent of the wage bill in 1914, and 36.1 per cent of the wage bill in 1928.[33] The following table gives the Quartile Ratios of Wage Frequency Distribution of Workers studied in specified Industries: Russia 1914; U.S.S.R. 1928.

	Industry	Ministry Of Trade, Study, Daily Wages, Russia, June 1914.	Central Bureau Of Labour State Study, Daily Wages, U. S. S. R., March 1928.
1.	Cotton Goods	57.8	63.5
2.	Linen goods, hemp products	51.6	61.1
3.	Saw mills, plywood, furniture, and other wood products	48.0	56.5
4.	Woollen and worsted goods	44.5	55.5
5.	Metal products, machinery and equipment	43.0	51.7
6.	Paper, printing	40.0	51.0
7.	Leather, shoe	38.5	53.7
8.	Rubber products, oil extraction and refining chemical products, matches etc.	54.2	52.7 [34]

Concerted efforts were made to obliterate the difference between the wages paid to skilled workers and the unskilled. This of course had

29. WEBB, Sidney And Beatrice: *"Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation"*, p. 595.
30. Cf. FRIEDMAN, E.M.—*"Russia In Transition"*, pp. 386-8.
31. DOBB Maurice—*"Soviet Economic Development Since 1917"*, p. 33.
32. BERGSON Abram—*"The Structure Of Soviet Wages"*, p. 70.
33. Ibid, p. 122.
34. Ibid, p. 69.

its effect on the general efficiency. However, it cannot be gainsaid that attempts were made to successfully level down the higher paid workers and raise the lower paid workers in order to bring about an equality in their earnings. Moreover equalitarianism was supposed to be one of the fundamental tenents of communism.[35]

Likewise the enviable position occupied by industrial workers can be very well understood in the light of the goal in view namely that of establishing proletarian dictatorship. On the eve of planning the proletariat was the most privileged class, in every way. Socially, the proletarian was rated highest. Economically, he was most richly rewarded. Politically, the whole policy was determined by the proletarian. He possessed the vetoing power. All that was best in the country in the fiields of education, entertainment, employment, housing accommodation, travel etc. went to him first. He had the topmost priority. The very word proletarian had become the "symbol of the good, the proper, the true".[36] In every walk of life, be it the judiciary or the executive, industry, school etc., he was the most exalted man. No higher honour could be expected than being called a proletarian. All this can be readily explained in terms of the communist obsession with the idea of the superiority of manual work over that by brain. Probing into the theory of productivity, the communist thinkers were impressed by the power of labour. According to them all production, including capital, is the ultimate result of labour. Hence the exalted position accorded to labour. Moreover the proletarian feels the reality of matter, with the help of his intimate physical contact. Thus "for him it is easy to grasp the materialist philosophy of life which is the very cornerstone of the collectivist economy".[37]

The five year plans were made with a view to increase production so as to raise the general standard of living. Sufficient care was taken to make the country self-sufficient. The planning authorities were fully aware of the deficiency of goods. Hence rationing was introduced at the very outset with a view to obtain a more or less equitable distribution of essential supplies. This had an equalising effect on income. Real wages were sought to be equalised in effect. The measure was taken for expediency. The outcome, however, was the narrowing down of the differences in income. Industrial workers were given a preference over others. The peasants were excluded from rationing.

Industry was controlled largely by the State even during the pursuance of the N.E.P. Agriculture was, to a large extent, controlled by private owners of land. The peasant was free to reap profits. Hence he was discriminated against when rationing was introduced. The avowed policy of the state was to collectivise land and eliminate free enterprise. With the increase in production by 1929 the decision to eliminate the Kulaks as a class was taken. Simultaneously collectivization of land was speeded up. Naturally enough, members of the proletarian strata were appointed to manage the collective farms. Collectivization was not a smooth process, however. The rich peasants naturally resented their being deprived of the freedom enjoyed so far.

35. Cf. HUBBARD L.E.—*"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 54.
36. Maurice HINDUS—*"Humanity Uprooted"*, p. 176.
37. Ibid, p. 177.

"By excessive taxation on their farms and by denying them a share in the small amount of manufactured goods available, the independent peasants were forced to collectivize".[38] In their enthusiasm to eliminate the Kulaks as a class, in order to abolish disparity of income, collectivization was carried to such a length that production was seriously hampered. It was very rightly feared that the excesses of collectivization might ultimately ruin prosperity. The very basis of prosperity was active co-operation between the peasants and the working class. Hence it was very rightly feared that the excesses of collectivization, by leading to non-co-operation on the part of peasants, might ultimately shatter the balance of the whole economy. Stalin severely reprimanded those responsible for the excesses. It was very correctly pointed out by him that the voluntary aspect in collectivization must never be neglected.[39]

So also, in industry the equalitarian tendency of wages operated till 1930. There was very little difference made between the skilled and the unskilled workers. Monetary incentives to production were sought to be substituted by social incentives. The workers were promised a paradise after the working of the first five year plan. All this resulted in the reduction in the quality of work put in. The policy of obliterating the difference between skilled work and ordinary work had disastrous consequences. Quantitative success could not adequately make up for the deficiency in quality. The higher technical and engineering staff was still subject to suspicion. They were required to see through the reaching of the planned target of production. The recruitment of unskilled workers made it very difficult to reach the target. And for all the lapses in production the engineers and the higher technical staff, who were entrusted with the work of management, were to be condemned. The trial of specialists heightened the atmosphere of suspicion. Besides they were not paid in proportion to their skill and responsibility. All this resulted in a very high turn-over. The severity of labour turn-over can be assessed by the fact that in May 1930 the U.S.S.R. Central Executive Committee came out with a regulation, prohibiting the payment of increased salaries to engineers and technicians whose salary was 250 roubles or more, if they moved from one enterprise to the other.[40] The conditions were highly unsuited to enhance production along right lines. Stalin, who could see through all this muddle, entirely disapproved of the state of affairs. Being very shrewed and practical he could easily diagnose the factors responsible for the unhealthy situation. In June 1931, Stalin sharply criticized the wage policy, which obliterated the difference between skilled and unskilled work. A conviction had grown that it was inconsistent with socialist ideology to grade wages according to skill. Stalin was all against this policy and pointed out that it was very essential to grade wages according to skill.[41]

The introduction of rationing had an equalising effect on the real wages. We have noted that the measure was taken for expediency and not with a deliberate view of attaining equality. In fact, right from its

38. HUBBARD L. "*Soviet Trade And Distribution*", p. 49.
39. Cf. BAYKOV, Alexander "*The Development Of The Soviet Economic System*", pp. 196-197.
40. Ibid, p. 215.
41. Ibid, p. 226.

very inception, the policy of rationing was not adopted uniformly. Richer peasants were deliberately excluded from receiving benefits of rationing. The authorities had introduced rationing with the avowed purpose of bettering the lot of the industrial workers. Even when the idea of equality of real wages was the accepted philosophy, or as we might call it a dogma, the workers belonging to Shock Brigades were given preferential treatment in respect of rationing. The Shock Brigades or the Oudarniks were those workers who put in more skill and work to increase output. They were not paid more than the rest of the workers. However "with the official rank of oudarnik went the right of buying larger rations at cheap ration prices, free or reduced price tickets for theatres, holidays at sanatoria in the Crimea or Caucasus, and some other privileges".[42] Apart from these material benefits an oudarnik was placed very high in the social scale. The number of proletarian workers enjoying the benefits of rationing increased every year. In 1930, 260 millions were the recipients while in 1934 the number had increased to 403 millions.[43] All this was quite in keeping with the avowed policy of creating the proletarian dictatorship. Regular grading was made. A special group of workers, which comprised of workers of Moscow, Leningrad, Baku, workers on the mines of Donbass, Dnepropetrousk, Magnitorsk and Kunzentz workers in armaments, engineering and chemical industries, received the highest amount of rations.[44] Then came the first group and the second group etc. in accordance with the importance of the industry. Since 1931 there has been a marked change in the policy. Equalitarianism was strongly criticized. And whatever equality of real wages persisted due to rationing, was sought to be nullified by creating regular hierarchy of recipients. Chamberlain notes down that he could observe a regular hierarchy of dining rooms in operation. At the top were the high officials, then came the oudarniks, ordinary workers and lowest of all were the Kulaks.[45] The preference given to the G.P.U. officials, military officials, party officials, skilled executives, skilled workers over the rest of the population was obviously a mark of social differentiation. And this social differentiation was of course accompanied by economic differentiation. Our thesis that there is a tendency for the existence of correlation between social status and economic condition is all the more strengthened. In fact Mr. STRAUSS, who is a keen student of conditions in the U.S.S.R. bitterly complains that "during the years 1931 to 1939 a vicious circle developed where the condition for better work was better living conditions, while the latter could be had only by better work."[46] Our study of capitalist societies presents the same results. If the same problem persists under a socialist system, wherein lies the difference between the two systems? As we shall soon see, the fundamental method of determining the remuneration, namely according to the skill, remains the same both under capitalism and under socialism. The order bearers have always been given special facilities. Soviet orders and titles are awarded as the recognition of special service to the country. We usually

42. HUBBARD L. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 46.
43. HUBBARD L. *"Soviet Trade And Distribution"*, p. 32.
44. Cf. BAYKOV A. *"The Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 237.
45. Cf. CHAMBERLAIN W. H. *"Russia's Iron Age"*, p. 112.
46. STRAUSS E. *"Soviet Russia"*, p. 243.

mean by special service some heroic exploits. In the U.S.S.R. "distinguished performance of common labour"[47] is sufficient ground for bestowing honour. The recipients of honour are paid special bonuses. Not only are they socially distinguished, but they also benefit materially.

Such was the state of affairs even when rationing was in force. Naturally enough the abolition of rationing meant even more scope for discriminating between the various layers of society. There can be no denying the fact that the society was stratified. A society can be said to be stratified when any section of the population is placed higher than the rest. The forms of stratification may be economic, political, or occupational. Pitrim SOROKIN very rightly asserts that even under a communistic rule, society can be said to be economically stratified so long as the "economic status of the members of a society is unequal".[48] The same principle is applicable to political and occupational stratification. Our study so far clearly brings out the fact of stratification of the society in the U.S.S.R. Mere inversion of the positions occupied by different sections of society cannot deny the presence of stratification. Thus, as we have noted the deliberate boosting up of the proletarian and the lowering down of the position of the intelligentsia does not in the least deny the fact of stratification.

With the abandonment of the idea of equality, stratification obtained more and more impressive character. Thus, as noted above, Stalin's criticism of the dogma of equalitarianism meant a sharp distinction between the skilled and the unskilled work. As a natural consequence the arbitrary deposement of the sections of population came to be substituted by the functioning of the natural system more or less. The natural system is none other than that where skill is accorded its proper place. The leading lights clearly realized that mere social incentives were not adequate for the putting in of the best effort. Material incentives had to be introduced to attain the same. Once for all was it realized that skill had to be better paid. The vital importance of skill in raising production was more than realised.

The inevitable corrollary to this was a change in the attitude towards the intelligentsia. Not only that the intelligentsia had to be better paid, but the suspicious attitude had also to be cast away. The term intelligentsia is used here to include the industrial and technical intelligentsia. The Soviet obsession with the superiority of manual labour makes itself felt here too. Actually even amongst the industrial technical intelligentsia a distinction was made on the basis of the nature of work. The administrative work in engineering concerns was definitely considered as lower than the actual working of machines. Thus the engineering and technical personnel which was concerned with actual production was better remunerated than the engineering and technical personnel employed in administration.[49] Even the housing and ration facilities available to the former type were distinctly better than those available to the latter type. By 1932 these privileges were extended to "specialists and technicians in the field of distribution and to chief and senior book-

47. BERGSON Abram *"The Structure Of Soviet Wages"*, p. 47.
48. SOROKIN P. *"Social Mobility"*, p. 11.
49. Cf. BAYKOV A. *"The Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 215.

keepers and their assistants in enterprises and institutions in the socialized sector".[50] Progressive income taxes over incomes exceeding 500 roubles a month were abolished. Instead a fixed 3.5 per cent tax on salaries was levied.[51] The natural result of this change in the policy was an increase in the inequality of income of this group between 1928 and 1934.

This change in attitude towards the intelligentsia was the outcome of two sets of factors. In the first instance we have noted how the suspicious atmosphere had to be done away with for the proper functioning af skill. Likewise we have noted how material incentives had to be reinstated. It was fully realised that social incentives by themselves did not work. Both types of incentives had to be combined thus. The second set of factors is the change in the recruitment of the intelligentsia. The Soviet suspicion was mainly directed against the pre-revolutionary intelligentsia. As a result of the state policy the old pre-revolutionary intelligentsia had died a natural death. Time and again it was emphasized that the intelligentsia must be recruited from amongst the workers. In 1935, Stalin clearly stated, "we do not need just any kind of managing or engineering staffs. We need such managing and engineering staffs as are capable of understanding the policy of our country's working class and are ready to put it conscientiously into effect".[52] Secondly, whatever element there was of the old intelligentsia had been rendered innocuous as a result of the severe restrictions imposed on them earlier. Very little remained of the old intelligentsia. Maurice HINDUS notes that in an automobile plant in Moscow out of the 968 engineers employed, only 61 belonged to the pre-Soviet intelligentsia.[53] The new intelligentsia was recruited from the proletarian class.

The change in the attitude is clearly reflected in the abolition of all irksome restrictions, which the intelligentsia had been made subject to. Thus from 1936 all educational establishments were thrown open to the children of all citizens, irrespective of their social origin. Higher salaries came to be paid to the intelligentsia, the logical outcome of which was Stakhanovism. There was an altogether new orientation of the whole class as such. The very wide inclusion of persons of various calling speaks for the liberalisation of the constituents of the group. The following was the composition of the Soviet intelligentsia in January 1937. All responsible workers on the staff of institutions and enterprises were included. The nature of the institutions and enterprises will be clear from the list given. The list includes[54] heads of administrative institutions and heads of health and cultural institutions; directors and managers of state industrial enterprises, workshops and departments and their deputies; chairmen of collective farms and their deputies, and managers of kolkhoz marketing farms; directors of the M.T.S., state farms and managers of state livestock farms; heads of producers' co-operative organisations; directors and managers of shops; directors and managers of canteens and other public catering establishments; Engi-

50. BERGSON A. *"The Structure Of Soviet Wages"*, p. 114.-
51. Ibid, p. 115.
52. BAYKOV, Alexander *"The Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 176.
53. HINDUS, Maurice *"Russia Fights On"*, p. 128.
54. Cf. BAYKOV A. *"Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 465.

neers and architects; trained technical personnel; agronomists; other agronomic staffs (surveyors, agrotechnicians, zooltechnicians); scientific workers (professors and other university staffs); teachers; cultural and other educational workers (journalists, librarians, club leaders etc.); arts workers; doctors; other medical personnel (assistants, midwives etc.); economists and statisticians; book-keepers and accountants; officers of law (judges, public prosecutors, coroners etc.); University students and; other members including the military. This very exhaustive list of the persons of various callings as composing the intelligentsia speaks volumes for its character. The character of Soviet intelligentsia is the outcome of the working of special forces such as the social, the political, the economic and the ideological in the U.S.S.R. It is a phenomenon arising out of the special sociological factors.

The wide grouping of intelligentsia might lead us to think that in the Soviet Union the dilemma between agriculture and industry, which has been the characteristic feature of capitalist societies, has been finally and satisfactorily resolved. Hence we proceed to examine the position enjoyed by agriculture vis-a-vis industry. We have noted how the leaders of revolution placed reliance on the industrial worker. It was, however, realized that agriculture could not be neglected. The failure of war communism made imperative the freedom of enterprise in agriculture. During the period of the New Economic Policy the kulaks were given almost free scope to reap profits, while there was no scope for free enterprise in industry. The kulaks exploited the opportunity given them. This action on their part militated against them. It was clearly realized that the free functioning of the kulaks as a class would hamper the establishment of socialistic system. Hence the decision was taken to eliminate the kulaks as a class. Agriculture was sought to be collectivized. Collectivization proceeded with vigour. The proportion of collectivized households to the non-collectivized households gives us a fair idea of its speeding up. In 1929 the proportion of collectivization was only 3.9 per cent; in 1930 it suddenly rose to 23 per cent and it went on increasing every year so that in 1934 it reached 73 per cent.[55] The effect of collectivization on the constituents of rural population can be very well understood if we compare the figures for 1928 and 1934. The number of kulaks was 5,618 in 1928 and 419 in 1934.[56] The number of independent peasants was 111,131 in 1928 and only 37,902 in 1934. The members of collectives and artels were only 4,406 in 1928 whereas in 1934 there were 77,037.[57] The number of rural wage and salary earners recorded a rise of more than hundred and fifty per cent. Thus there were only 2,219 rural wage and salary earners in 1928 whereas in 1934 they were 5,367.[58]

Collectivization of agriculture caused distress to the peasants in more than one way. First and foremost they lost all freedom. The state exacted grain from them. Even after the crop failure of 1931 the state exactions were not only nót relaxed but were intensified on the contrary. Moreover the price of grain as fixed by the state was ridiculously low when compared to the prices of manufactured articles. As a

55. DE BASILY *"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, p. 285.
56. Colin, CLARK *"A Critique Of Russian Statistics"*, p. 47.
57. Ibid, p. 47.
58. Ibid, p. 47.

natural consequence the peasant was in distress. Taxation on farms was collected in kind. On an average it works at about 17-18 per cent of the income derived from farms. The peasants are subject to additional burden in the shape of higher prices of commodities.[59] MAYNARD points out that this does not obtain in every case for the value of land differs from region to region. He further points out that what is basically wrong with the fiscal policy in respect to land is not so much the double burden of taxation on the peasant, as the inadequate differentiation of land and the insufficiently elastic nature of provisions for failures and partial failures of crop.[60] This point we shall discuss a little later, since it is very pertinent to the proper discussion of the differences between rural and industrial earnings. At any rate it is very difficult to deny the sad plight of the peasant. Collectivization was in most of the cases against the peasants' will. The application of force resulted in many malpractices. The attitude of the heads of the kolkhozes towards the peasants was so bad as to merit castigation by the Pravada. Pravada of May 17, 1935 reports that in a kolkhoze, where hard piece of land was being brought under cultivation, the men were kept ploughing throughout the whole day.[61] The heads of the kolkhoze are severely blamed for tolerating this "inadmissible humiliation of human dignity".[62] This was the natural outcome of the humiliations to which the peasants were made subject during the course of collectivization. Rural income per head was estimated to have been 35 per cent of urban income per head in 1913.[63] In 1928 the proportion had dwindled down to 24.5 per cent.[64] To add to the trouble, the prices of industrial goods had risen higher than those of agricultural products. Thus on the very eve of planning the rural worker compared badly with the industrial worker so far as the economic condition is considered. As a result of collectivization the income of an able-bodied kolkhoznik, when fully employed is estimated to have been not more than Rs. 350 in 1935, whereas the average wage income of urban classes was Rs. 2,270. This disparity is quite understandable in the light of the stepmotherly attitude of the state towards agriculture. In 1935, agricultural production was credited with only 16 per cent of the total national income, whereas industrial production was credited with 52 per cent.[65] On the very face of it, this estimate seems to be the outcome of a determined policy to boost up the industrial worker and belittle the peasant. During the earlier years of planning the peasant was discriminated against. He was denied the benefits of rationing. Furthermore the peasant was paid arbitrarily low price for his produce. MAYNARD is constrained to admit, when writing about the greater proportion of taxation of peasant in kind, that such compulsory deliveries were "paid for at a very low conventional price".[66] All this results in the disparity between rural and urban income. According to the esti-

59. MAYNARD John *"The Russian Peasant And Other Studies"*, p. 488.
60. Ibid, pp. 488-489.
61. DE BASILY *"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, f.n., p. 299.
62. Ibid, f.n., p. 299.
63. Colin CLARK *"A Critique Of Russian Statistics"*, p. 21.
64. Ibid, p. 21.
65. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Trade And Distribution"*, pp. 298-299.
66. MAYNARD John *"Russian Peasant And Other Studies"*, p. 485.

mates made by Colin CLARK, the agricultural income per head was £. 37.5 (calculated in terms of Sterling) in 1934, when the non-agricultural income per head was £ 85.5; in 1937 the respective figures were £ 42.5 and £ 122.5[67] This disparity is all-the-more to be criticized for even skilled workers in agriculture like the tractor drivers, who are obviously the best paid farm workers since they earn in a month what ordinary field workers earn in a year, earn only as much as a factory worker does.[68] HUBBARD is inclined to ascribe the lower level of rural earnings to the fact that "industrial labour is far more mechanised than farm labour".[69] Whatever the reasons put forth the fundamental fact remains that the "Bolsheviks have not succeeded in surmounting the capitalist notion that agricultural labour shall receive a smaller pecuniary reward than the industrial labour".[70] And in so far as the notion persists, the dilemma remains unresolved. This brief discussion brings out the inequality of position between agriculture and industry. Now we proceed to study the inequalities operating in the industry itself, as well as the inequality of incomes and the corresponding social position in other activities like the professions, service in the protective forces, members of the Communist party etc.

Our usual method of classifying the population into the professions, the skilled workers, the unskilled workers etc. cannot be followed with advantage in the case of the U.S.S.R. There are various reasons why we cannot do so. First and foremost the classification of the population, according to the official presentation, does not give us any idea about the real nature of the same. Thus the class composition of the population includes the following categories. Working population, individual peasants, collective farmers, other sections of the population—these are the categories of people in 1937.[71] Naturally enough the bourgeoisie and the kulaks do not figure since they were already eliminated. The percentage of population formed by these categories were as follows. Working population was 34.7 p.c.; individual peasants 5.6 p.c.; collective farmers 55.5 p.c.; and other sections of the population 4.2 p.c.[72] This classification obviously reflects the stand taken by the state. There is a point blank refusal to admit of such classes as the professionals, private entrepreneurs etc. The obsession of creating of worker's state readily accounts for the classification of population. Secondly, where the whole system is sought to be planned in a regular fashion the place of pride is naturally enough occupied by those responsible for the planning. This. of course, is never admitted by the Soviets. Even this is the result of their obsession of a workers' state. The facts, however clearly prove that those responsible for planning are at the helm of affairs. Thirdly, the incomes of different groups are very arbitrarily determined. Thus the professionals have a very limited scope to earn as much as they like. A concerted effort is made to curb the independence of the professionals. The industrial workers, on the other hand are given full scope to earn

67. Colin CLARK *"A Critique Of Russian Statistics"*, p. 68.
68. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, pp. 268-269.
69. Ibid, p. 268.
70. Ibid, p. 268.
71. HIRLEKAR K. S. (Edited By) *"Soviet Russia"*, p. 382.
72. Ibid, p. 382.

their maximum possible. By the industrial workers we of course mean the higher technical and engineering staff also. The rise of Stakhanovism abudantly illustrate the freedom of betterment granted to the industrial workers. With the abandoning of the idea of equality, impetus was given to skill. Moreover, the abolition of rationing let loose the forces of skill. Alexander BAYKOV, very correctly stresses that "the abolition of rationing was not only an economic, but also a social and psychological event of the greatest significance".[73] Thus the restriction of the scope for development of a particular section of the population, simultaneously with the granting of full scope to another calls for a change in the method of classification on our part. Our usual method of starting with the topmost class can, however, be adhered to. In the place of lords, nobles, financial and industrial magnets we start here with those responsible for planning. We mean thereby the official controlling group. There can be no denying the existence of the same in the face of the fact that in the U.S.S.R. only one ideology is admitted of and that is the official ideology. There obtains even monopoly of thinking. "No doctrine, be it philosophical, historical, social or political, is tolerated if it differs from the dogmas of materialism".[74] Small wonder need be felt if other spheres of life are very absolutely controlled. Hence it is in the fitness of things that we start with such controllers, namely the bureacrats.

Right from the October revolution, bureacratic element was there. The bureacracy was composed, however, of the workers. The disastrous effects of the same were to be found in the all round inefficiency and in the falling production. The members of the Communist Party have been dominating the scene right from the beginning. Earlier we have noted how only those who were members of the party were appointed to responsible positions. The adoption of the New Economic Policy did not work out a change in the controlling group. The dogma of equalitarianism persisted till 1931. Actually, as we have seen, the dogma prevailed in practice till the abolition of rationing. Stalin had clearly introduced the system of paying according to the quantity of the work. Private enterprise in industry was legally barred. The place of private entrepreneurs was taken up by the managers appointed by the State. All these managers were of course the members of the party. With the elimination of kulaks as a class and collectivization of agriculture, the management of farms was entrusted to the responsible members of the party. With the ever increasing necessity of stepping up production the managers were given very wide powers. Another important point to be noted in this connection is that in their drive for efficiency political considerations came to be connived at, in the sense that the principle of social origin was not insisted upon rigorously. We should of course bear in mind that most of the new intelligentsia had come from the proletarian class. Increasing facilities were given to the managers. "In order to stimulate the interest of managers in the profitableness of their enterprise's work and to help enforce personal management, an institution was created called the 'director's profits' fund'."[75] In the earlier years the monetary incentives were absent. The captains of industry, the Commissars were not

73. BAYKOV Alexander *"The Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 335.
74. DE BASILY *"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, p. 417.
75. BAYKOV A. *"Development Of The Soviet Economic System"*, p. 297.

paid very highly. The lure of high salary was, however, substituted by an increase in power and a considerably higher standard of living than the rest of the population. The best of the amenities of life were made available to the Soviet Official.[76] Even the managers of co-operative shops were invariably the party officials.[77] Such was the state of affairs even before 1934. With the intensification of economic planning experts came to be appointed as managers. The freeing of skill meant the betterment of the experts. A man came to be judged by his position. Those who lagged behind were treated as worthless. Those at the top were granted the best facilities. A conviction came to grow that those who enjoyed the best facilities were most worthy. There was a regular hierarcy observed based on the seniority, usefulness, etc. The new ruling class was quite conscious of its power.[78] All the same proletarian appearances were kept up. The leaders got the best of everything. With the abolition of rationing provision was made to differentiate their pay so as to purchase the best things. Lipservice to the world revolution and the proletarian cause continued to be paid. But within the party "an influential inner ring having a vested interest in the things as they are, and enjoying more privilege and more comfort (though not more wealth) than the rank and file of the population",[79] had firmly established itself. It is precisely on these grounds that Maurice HINDUS points out the falsity of the claim that the factory workers in Russia enjoy the best living conditions. Though of course "of all the people in the land none has received such profuse verbal pampering".[80] Yet the fact remained that the workers remained mere workers and they had masters over them. It is precisely in this sense that FRIEDMAN maintains that though the exploitation of labour by private capital has stopped, its place has been taken by the new class of exploiters, namely the "Soviet managers and bureaucrats in industry".[81]

The signs of their increasing power became unmistakably clear since the decision to open 'commercial shops'. In open shops the prices charged were exorbitant. The very fact of the opening of such shops signifies the presence of surplus income in some section of the community. It meant the very negation of the doctrine of equality. Hence the leftists opposed the measure. However, by then "all the power of the party was rapidly becoming concentrated in the hands of a small oligarchy and opposition from any side could no longer influence policy".[82] This obviously meant higher consumption by the richer group. And who were rich if not the managers and the higher officials who wielded the control, in short the bureacrats?

The replacement of the industrial-elite by the intellectual elite was responsible for their increasing material prosperity. This is not to suggest the revival of old relationship between the bureacratic elite and the workers. However, a sense of social distinction emerged. And it was

76. Cf. CHAMBERLAIN W. H. "*Russia's Iron Age*", pp. 268-269.
77. Cf. HUBBARD L. E. "*Soviet Trade And Distribution*", p. 76.
78. CILIGIA A. "*The Russian Enigma*", p. 118.
79. MAYNARD John "*Russian Peasant And Other Studies*", p. 404.
80. Ibid, p. 155.
81. FRIEDMAN M. E. "*Russia In Transition*", p. 430.
82. HUBBARD L. E. "*Soviet Trade And Distribution*", p. 57.

to be seen everywhere. In trains or in best hotels or watering places, the best places were meant only for party officials. HUBBARD notes down from his experience that there was "very little social intercourse between the manual worker class and the official intellectual class".[83] This was the inevitable result of the economic affluence of the powerful elite. Their affluence is reflected in the increasing demand for luxury goods. Taking the year 1933 as the base year, the index of production in 1938 was as follows for the various types of cloth. For Cotton it was only 127.8; Woolens..........132.4; Linen........193.7; and silk........226.5.[84] Continuing the same base the index of sales in 1938 was 650.0 for furniture; 1660.0 for musical instruments; sports goods 1480.0; books and journals 1440.0.[85] The increasing demand for cultural and luxury goods obviously reflects the widening of the gulf. The conclusions formed by A. Rudolf, after 39 months sojourn in the U.S.S.R., namely that "Instead of 'socialist enthusiasm', indifference and the bureacratic spirit, instead of a "new morale', unbounded egoism and the right of the strongest; instead of 'society without classes', a social inequality daily more marked"[86] admirably sum up the entire situation.

And all this was the natural corrollary to the state ownership of industry. It is important to note that the ownership went to the state and not to the society. As everywhere else the state in the U.S.S.R. was controlled by a few and not by the whole of the society. "The state exists within society........ It supports or exploits, curbs or liberates, fulfils or even destroys, the social life over which it is invested with control".[87] "It is perfectly understandable that the state is mere "agency of the community". However sometimes the state has been mainly an exploitative power, controlling the rest of the population in the interest of a dominant class".[88] And it invariably happens that for all practical purposes the state and the Government tend to coincide. "For the State is for the purposes of practical administration, the government..........."[89] The natural consequence was the supreme authority of Government officials. Those who governed could get the best advantages. While those who did not have any part in the governing, namely the workers had only to work. The perfecting of the power of the bureacracy resulted out of the very composition of the same. The officials of the Communist Party were appointed as managers. Later on with the increasing need of economic development efficient persons came to be appointed as managers, irrespective of their political career. Things came to such a pass that the latter gained the upperhold to such an extent that the party officials had to follow their line of action. And the line of action was none other than the effective strengthening of their hold so as to guard their vested interests. Hence the protracted controversy with the older revolutionaries, who stood for workers' control, which ultimately resulted in their liquidation. The

83. HUBBARD L. E. "*Soviet Labour And Industry*", p. 284.
84. Ibid, p. 287.
85. Ibid, p. 286.
86. DE BASILY (Quoted By) "*Russia Under Soviet Rule*", f.n. 2, p. 464.
87. MACIVER R. M. "*The Modern State*", p. 5.
88. MACIVER R. M. "*Society*", p. 286.
89. LASKI H. J. "*A Grammar Of Politics*", p. 131.

Moscow trails of 1936 signify the defeat of the revolution and the final victory of the bureaucrats.[90]

This, rather elaborate discussion of the position of the controlling group or the bureaucrats is warranted by facts of the situation. In fact it would have been impossible to understand the real nature of the social structure in the U.S.S.R. without a detailed discussion of the bureaucrats and their power. James BURNHAM points out that "those who control the state, those whose interests are primarily served by the state, are the ruling class under the structure of state-owned economy. Through the state, they will control access to the instruments of production. Through the state, they will control the distribution of the products of those instruments so that they themselves receive the privileged share".[91] Does not this description perfectly fit in with the bureacracy we have discussed? We shall examine in detail Burnham's thesis of 'managerial revolution' at a later stage. For the present it is sufficient for our purpose to note that the most important position was occupied by the bureaucrats, namely the managers in a wide sense of the term.

It is indeed very interesting to note the curious fact that the authors, artists and cultural performers constitute the group earning highest income in the U.S.S.R. Needless to say that this group is not attached to any institution. In short theirs is a free enterprise. It is quite in keeping with the general social principles working in the U.S.S.R. that income from private enterprise is made subject to considerably higher taxation than income from employment in state enterprises. The following table makes it quite clear.[92]

Annual Income	RATE OF TAX PER CENT OF INCOME FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES				
	Wages & Salary	Royalties etc.	Co-operative Production	Free Handicrafts	Private Practice Of Professions
R.					
2,400	1.35	1.35	1.49	6.00	1.76
6,000	2.80	2.80	3.08	13.40	3.58
12,000	4.20	4.20	4.82	24.10	11.46
24,000	5.60	5.77	6.16	37.30	22.90
50,000	6.33	7.73	6.96	49.10	30.75

The most significant point is that while the highest amount specified as the income of salary earners is R. 24,000, a provision exists for taxing writers and artists upto an income of R. 300,000.[93] Does this not suggest that artists and writers are much more highly remunerated than professionals? Alexis Tolstoi, a Soviet writer in an article contributed to the Pravada in 1937 gave the following information about the income of authors. According to him there were 14 authors receiving over 120,000 roubles a year; 11 authors receiving between 72,000 and 120,000 roubles a year; 39 authors receiving between 24,000 and 36,000 roubles a year;

90. Cf. STRAUSS E. *"Soviet Russia"*, p. 301.
91. BURNHAM James *"The Managerial Revolution"*, p. 106.
92. The Table Is Quoted From HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 220.
93. Ibid, p. 220.

114 authors receiving between 12,000 and 24,000 roubles a year; 137 authors receiving between 6,000 and 12,000 roubles a year and 4,000 authors receiving upto 6,000 roubles a year.[94]

Thus writers, musicians, actors, lecturers, earn much more than even the most energetic Stakhanovites, whose income we shall presently study. Even more surprising feature about these high incomes is that the inheritance tax is very liberal. In fact it is much more liberal than that in the United States of America. Government bonds are exempted from any levy.[95] And there is no other channel of investment for Soviet citizens.

Next we come to the professionals. It is certainly difficult to define the professionals as a class. For in many instances their services are already engaged in state enterprises. Thus they have very little freedom of enterprise. The main characteristic of this class, namely that they are recruited from the intelligentsia persists in the U.S.S.R. too. Another characteristic of the professional, namely the difference between the earning capacity of its members and that of the workers also obtains. No doubt the salaries paid by the state are very low. Hence they are required to supplement their earnings, wherever possible, by private practice. We should not forget that before 1935 professions were among the worst paid occupations as a result of the policy of distrust and suspicion. Despite the atmosphere of suspicion the youngsters had always the ambition of becoming intellectual workers.[96] This was something remarkable in view of the communist preaching of the equality of man and dignity of human labour. This must have been the motive working behind increasing facilities for higher training.[97] The very fact that those holding a degree were preferred to those without it for appointment to responsible jobs speaks volumes for the increasing importance attached to the intelligentsia.[98] Earlier we have noted how the intelligentsia was purposely paid lower than the industrial workers. This state of affairs ceased to obtain after a change in the attitude of the state. However, it cannot be said that professionals were paid much higher than industrial workers, especially the skilled workers. The figures of salaries obtained by the various professions, stated below, make it abundantly clear. Thus in the educational profession[99]—University professors got between R. 1,100-1,500 per month. University lecturers got between R. 700-900 per month. Directors of studies in technical schools got between R. 475-570 per month. Teachers in technical schools got between R. 340-405 per month. Directors of secondary schools got between R. 400-600 per month. Teachers in secondary schools got between R. 310-425 per month. Teachers in primary schools got between R. 270-400 per month. School inspectors got between R. 650-700 per month. In the legal profession—Peoples Court Executives earned between R. 300-375 per month; People's Court Secretaries earned between R. 250-325 per month.[100] In the me-

94. Ibid, p. 221.
95. Cf. Maurice HINDUS "*Russia Fights On*", p. 88.
96. Cf. HUBBARD L. E. "*Soviet Labour And Industry*", p. 65.
97. Ibid, p. 65.
98. Ibid, p. 120.
99. Ibid, p. 172.
100. Ibid, p. 172.

dical profession—Dentists got R. 265-390, per month; Dispensary managers R. 375-630, per month; Qualified dispenser R. 325-450 per month; Senior operating theatre sister R. 240-365 per month. In Commerce—Managers of trading concerns got R. 750-1,200 per month. In the post office—Directors got R. 1,200-1,800 per month; Departmental managers R. 480-600 per month; Chief cashiers R. 480-600 per month; Engineers R. 600-1,000 per month; Telegraphists in large centres R. 240-440 per month; and Telephone exchange operators R. 190-320 per month. Technical experts in charge of departments of the Commissariat of Agriculture earned R. 850-1,200 per month. In Arts—Concert singers attached to musical institutions and giving ten performances a month earned R. 400-2,000, per month; while for single performances elsewhere R. 50-600.[101] We have already noted how artists earned much higher than the rests of the professions.

We shall discuss in brief Stakhanovism, for much has been made of it. The word finds its origin in the application of rationalisation by Stakhanov, who was a coal hewer. What he did was to devise a detailed division of labour in the process of hewing coal. As a consequence Stakhanov hewed out in 6 hours 102 tons of coal, and thus earned 225 roubles for a shift, which exceeded the monthly earnings of a coalminer.[102] We have already noted how piece wages were introduced. At the end of 1932 more than 60 per cent of all industrial workers and employees were paid at piece rates.[103] And this system gave a fresh impetus to produce more. Moreover with the abolition of rationing, and the consequent increase in the inequality of real incomes, it became imperative on every worker to put in his best to produce more. The socio-economic conditions were auspicious for the rise of Stakhanovism. Stakhanov's method was very widely imitated so as to earn the title Stakhanovism. The result was not only increased production, but an increase in the norms of production. The increasing material reward was also one of the factors in the rise of Stakhanovism. For every worker who increased his output in excess of the fixed norm was given a bonus, which was much higher than the proportionate increase in the output. Thus, according to the instructions issued by the Commissariat of Light Industry of the 4th October 1935, cotton textile operatives were to be paid bonus of 10 per cent on the whole of their output if they exceeded the standard task set them by 5 per cent or less, and a bonus of 15 per cent in case their output exceeded the standard by more than 5 per cent.[104] It is certainly beyond doubt that a Stakhanovite is a better worker than an ordinary worker. As such he commands respect of the manager. He enjoys a privileged position in every sense of the term. By the end of 1935 Stakhanovists were given priority when being sent to sanatoria, rest homes, health resorts, etc. By 1938 the proportion of Stakhanov workers engaged in the various branches of industry was 41.4% of all workers in industry.[105] Their increasing power is clearly reflected in the fact that "all the industrial workers selected to the Council of the Union (House of Assembly in the

101. Ibid, p. 172.
102. BAYKOV A. "*The Development Of The Soviet Economic System*", p. 336.
103. Cf. HUBBARD L. E. "*Soviet Labour And Industry*", p. 62.
104. Ibid, p. 79.
105. BAYKOV A. "*The Development Of The Soviet Economic System*", p. 350.

Soviet Parliament) in December 1937 were Stakhanovites.[106] They were thus the whole and sole representatives of the working class. And it would not be wrong to suppose that they lent support to the governmental policy, as a result of their privileged position. The Trade Unions have always been authoritative in the Soviet Union so that no opportunity is given to workers to voice their grievances. The Trade Unions are of course controlled by the Stakhanovites, who have been pampered by the state, with the natural result that the workers are left unprotected.

It was quite possible for Stakhanovite workers to earn as much as R. 1,000-1,200 per month, whereas the average wage of the industrial worker, at the end of 1937, was little less than R. 250 per month.[107] We have it of the same authority that monthly earnings to the tune of R. 2,000-3000 were not rare.[108]

Stakhanovism thus spelled such large inequalities of income. Moreover it came to foster group work, not that it was initiated by the author. We have already noted how the norms of production were raised. It was the leader of the group who stood to be congratulated on the rise in output. It was also customary to bestow special rewards and bonuses on the group leader. It was conveniently forgotten that the workers contributed to the increase in the outputs. The keen competition to increase output told heavily on the workers who did not stand to benefit proportionately. Actually the real tragedy lay in this. The following figures make it quite clear. In the generation of electrical power the system of premiums for work in excess of the norm was[109]:

Excess Work In Percent Of Norm	CHARACTER OF WORK		
	Medium Percent Premium	Difficult Percent Premium	Very Difficult Percent Premium
1—10	25	25	50
11—20	50	60	100
Over 20	75	100	150

And usually the Stakhanovist leader "received most or all the premium won by his group for surpassing the norm".[110]

The position of the technical and engineering staff improved after 1931. In the Kirov works the basic rates of pay for engineers in charge of smelting furnaces was R. 700 a month, while shift foremen were paid R. 500 a month.[111] Skilled factory workers earned from R. 350 a month upwards, while technical workers or mechanics and fitters earned R. 600 a month and upwards.[112] Skill came to be a commodity. This can be easily seen from the comparative earnings of technical staff, clerical personnel and Sub-ordinate personnel. The average monthly earnings in 1935 are as follows[113]: Technical Staff 437.0; Clerical Personnel 234.2; Subordinate Personnel 118.9.

106. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 81.
107. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Trade And Distribution"*, pp. 282-283.
108. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 170.
109. STRAUSS E. *"Soviet Russia"*, p. 286.
110. Ibid, p. 287.
111. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 109.
112. Ibid, p. 170.
113. DE BASILY *"Russia Under Soviet Rule"*, f.n. 1, p. 370.

It is certainly interesting to note that a difference was made between salary earners and wage earners, even during 1928 and 1934. Thus taking all industries the average earning of salaried workers in per cent of average earning of wage earners was 172.0 in 1928 and increased to 192.0 in 1934.[114]

A mention must be made of convict labour. Because this played a very important part in the construction of canals, hydro-electric dams, railways, roads, etc. Obviously enough convict labour was the creation of the G.P.U. In their untiring efforts to crush the free peasantry many unfavoured persons were imprisoned and made to work. It cannot be denied that heavy work was imposed on them. This reminds us of the serfdom in Tsarist Russia. However, the use of convict labour appreciably declined after 1936.[115]

Indirectly we have noted how a change had worked in the policy, from equality of remuneration to differential remuneration to such a large extent. The question whether the principles working behind the determination of remuneration are capitalist or socialist, is to my mind absolutely irrelevent. Much is made of this usually. For it is conveniently forgotten that socialism is but a later stage of capitalism. Socialism presupposes no equality of payment but equality of opportunity. And this is rendered feasible by the state ownership of all the means of production so that vested interests, and the inequality of opportunity consequent upon it are eliminated. No state can ignore economic considerations as long as resources, both human and material are limited. Therefore those who can help the economisation of production come to be paid more. And this was done in the Soviet Union. It cannot be gainsaid that along with the social, material incentives were also offered to increase and improve production. Much has been made of socialist emulation. "The activity and initiative of the working people in the struggle to over-fulfil the national economic plans is most vividly expressed in socialist emulation (or "socialist competition"), of which the Stakhanov movement is the highest form".[116] It is conveniently forgotten that material rewards always accompanied the social. Thus the Stalin Prize carried with it substantial amount in addition to the social honour. The following observation made by Sydney WEBB and Beatrice WEBB is very likely to be misunderstood. "There is only a single social grade in the U.S.S.R., that of a producer by hand or brain........This is what is meant by the "classless society", in which each serves in accordance with his ability, and is provided for appropriately to his needs".[117] This seems to suggest that despite differences of ability there is a trend towards equality of rewards. Staunch sympathisers of the Soviet Union, like Mr. CARR, are constrained to accept that "the equality preached in the Soviet Union is not an equality of function or an equality of reward. Socially important functions discharged or socially important work done are legitimate and relevant grounds for inequality."[118] However, he

114. BERGSON Abram *"Structure Of Soviet Wages"*, Table 9, p. 117.
115. HUBBARD L. E. *"Soviet Labour And Industry"*, p. 149.
116. KURSKY A. *"Russia Has A Plan"*, p. 20.
117. Sydney WEBB And Beatrice WEBB *"Soviet Communism—A New Civilisation"*, Vol. II, p. 1126.
118. CARR E. H. *"The Soviet Impact On The Western World"*, p. 45.

maintains that there is no differentiation on the basis of sex, race or class.[119] Many other authors strike the same note, e.g., Maurice DOBB, Anton CILIGIA, John MAYNARD etc. to mention only the better known ones. Hence we proceed to examine, in the light of the facts studied so far, whether classes exist in the U.S.S.R., and if there is any correlation between social position and income.

IV

It has been repeated *ad nauseam* that in the U.S.S.R. there are no classes. The very ideal of the Soviet Union has all along been the abolition of all classes and the creation of a 'classless society'. And it is proclaimed that it has been achieved. To understand properly the significance of this assertion it is very essential to examine their conception of a class. Earlier we have discussed fully the concept of class. That discussion shall be fruitful in pointing out the error in the conception of class in the Soviet Union. We have noted that class is determined by a totality of factors such as the economic, the social, the political and the cultural. In short it is a sociological concept par excellence.

Let us see now, what exactly is meant by a class in the Soviet Union. A word about the social background is necessary. To put it in a nutshell the doctrine of historical materialism has been the guiding force in the Soviet Union even since before its establishment. The acclaimed predominance of material factors is at the basis of all their social doctrines. And this impact of historical materialism has not been restricted only to the U.S.S.R. Its impact on the world outside is reflected in the fact that "greater prominence is given in contemporary life and thought than ever before to the economic foundations of the social order."[120] The same author opines that the impact can be attributed possibly to the Soviet Union. If such be the impact on the world at large, how much more strongly felt it must be in the Soviet Union itself ! The indelible impression made by the Marxist doctrine of historical materialism can be very well seen from the views put forth by Russian sociologists. Thus Plekhanov, who "describes himself as dialectic and monistic materialist",[121] maintains that "the psychology of society adopts itself to its economy. Upon a given economic basis there inevitably develops a corresponding ideological superstructure."[122] Another sociologist of repute, Peter Struve maintains that "social classes express economic distinctions within a given social environment."[123] Tugan Baronovski, acquiescing in the theory that the main differentiating factor in social classes was the economic, proceeds to define a social class "as a social group, the members of which find themselves in a like economic position towards an appropriation by one group of the surplus labour of another group, and who therefore have common economic interests and

119. Ibid, p. 45.
120. Ibid, p. 89.
121. HECKER J. H. "*Russian Sociology*", p. 210.
122. Ibid, p. 215.
123. Ibid, p. 221.

common antagonists."[124] The two main classes have been the owners of production and the workers or the producers. There is an inevitable conflict between the two. And the October Revolution aimed at the abolition of classes by destroying rights of private ownership of the means of production. Instead, the state becomes the owner of the means of production. Hence the classes ceased to exist. The fundamental problem was resolved. It is obviously in this sense that the Soviet Union is said to have a classless society. Having abolished the classes (namely those of owners of production and workers or producers), the differences in income have ceased to be the disturbing element. Obviously enough, this is the type of reasoning adopted by John SOMERVILLE. Thus he says, "There are different levels of income, in accordance with the quantity of the work performed; there are also different levels of culture, tastes and interest. Such phenomena are, of course, a very different thing from classes as that term is defined in Marxian thought".[125] Thus it is by definition that there are no classes in the Soviet Union. We need not labour the point that the very definition of a class is faulty, being purposely limited to suit a particular doctrine. The method followed by them is that of imputing a specifically limited content to the concept of class. The concept of class is very wide and must take into account a totality of situations. The wilful delimitation of the concept of class merely to the economic aspects is, to say the least, erroneous. As such we need not take the assertion that there are no classes in the Soviet Union at its face value. It is for us to judge whether or not classes exist in the U.S.S.R. from the data presented so far. Further, we have to examine the correlation between the economic and social position.

There can be no denying the fact that the most privileged section of the people is the bureaucracy. We can describe it as the topmost class, for not only does it enjoy the best social and economic privileges, but also wields power in sufficient degree to be able to maintain the status quo. Next in order, stands the intelligentsia, which is composed of authors, technical and engineering staff, professionals like the legal and medical practitioners, university professors, school teachers, public singers and artists. This class earns high income, and is socially highly placed. The Stakhanovists, of course, come next. We have noted the social and economic privileges enjoyed by them. Then come the industrial workers, the peasants, the farm workers and last of all the convict labour. This is, in fine, the class composition of the U.S.S.R. Our study of the income of the various sections of the population amply proves the lessening of the scope for those belonging to the lower strata and the ever-widening scope to those belonging to the higher strata. The capitalists have been substituted by the bureaucrats who wield immense power. The condition of the workers has not been radically changed. Skill is valued both economically and socially. The attainment of socialist rule, to a considerable degree, has not been able to alter the fundamental relationship between the skilled and the unskilled, between agriculture and industry, between the rulers and the ruled.

It is more than proved that economic planning cannot set aside the fundamental relationships in a society. The correlation between social

124. Ibid, p. 223.
125. SOMERVILLE John *"Soviet Philosophy"*, p. 15.

status and economic position cannot be annihilated by planning. The dismal failure of the Soviet experiment of creating an industrial workers' aristocracy serves as an excellent pointer. As long as human skill is limited in a population it shall continue to be socially and economically honoured. In fact the very Marxian dogma of the economic determinism acted as a Boomerang on their fantastic experiment of the inversion of classes. It is fashionable to attribute the reverses of the Soviet policy of equalitarianism to the hold of the bureaucracy. Thus James BURNHAM develops his favourite theory of the Managerial Revolution, wherein he maintains that the managers have substituted the old capitalists. Describing the transition from a capitalist society to the managerial society, he says, "what is occurring in this transition is a drive for social dominance, for power and privilege, for the position of ruling class, by the social group or class of the managers."[126] But who were the bureaucrats if not the most efficient persons? As far as our problem is concerned the very fact that power came to be restored to the most resourceful group of people is sufficient to vindicate our thesis that social status and economic position go together and that skill is valued both socially and economically.

126. BURNHAM James "*The Managerial Revolution*", p. 64.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

In the introductory chapter we have stated how the general relationship between the economic forces and social classification will not suffice to illuminate the relation between social differentiation and the economic emoluments which is the problem we set out to investigate. In order to investigate the same we found it absolutely essential to introduce the factor of skill, which helps in explaining the occupational position as well as the remuneration. We realised that in order to avoid circular reasoning it was very necessary to consider the factor of skill. The factor of skill has been woefully neglected in earlier works in the treatment of the problem of social classification and economic differentiation. The natural outcome of such neglect was circular reasoning. It is true that certain notable authors like Gunnar LANDTMAN, C. C. NORTH, R. H. TAWNEY etc. took cognisance of the factor of ability in accounting for the phenomenon of social differentiation. Yet no systematic attempt was made to work out the correlation between skill and social position. Only a general relation was hinted at. And we have made efforts to work out the same systematically. Our problem was thus to investigate the interrelationship between social status, skill and remuneration. It was three dimensional at once. By introducing the third dimension, namely that of skill we may claim to have advanced further, at least by few steps, in the analysis of the phenomenon of social differentiation. In fact our contribution lies not so much in the introduction of the factor of skill, but in the systematic working out of the correlation between skill and remuneration, which eventually points out the deep interrelationship between social status, skill and remuneration.

In order to discount the special effects of the peculiar features of a social system we selected for our study three different social systems. The choice of the three social systems was guided by the main consideration of attaining a large measure of generality. The three social systems we studied were the English Society right from the feudal times to modern times, the Indian society, both when caste was predominant and when it has been disintegrating, and the communistic society of the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republic. And the study of these diverse social systems gives a large degree of generality to our conclusions. For the three diverse social systems are in themselves fairly representative of the main social systems which have prevailed so far.

In our study of the English society during feudal times we have noted how a person's status was determined by birth. The entire social hierarhy was more or less fixed. Yet the economic factor, which in itself was the outcome of the biological phenomenon, namely the Black Death, immensely improved the status of the serf. Serfs gained their freedom due to their economic betterment. Differentiation came to be made amongst the serfs on economic basis. Thus those who could pay in cash the prescribed due to the lord were distinguished from those who had to render service to the lord. Though there were few skilled occupations then, even amongst such as existed it is remarkable to note that a

systematic gradation was made on the basis of skill. Still occupations which brought about contact with the lords were considered socially high. Thus in this period we see that social status was based on birth and remuneration, correlation between skill and remuneration was not established. It had only just begun to appear.

The decline of feudalism and its final disintegration meant a change over from a society based on status by birth to a society ruled by free contract. The development of markets and the growth of towns only accelerated the process of change. However, villien status continued to be looked down upon. For it was usually a bar to entrance into guilds, which were formed to prevent trade from any encroachment. The three phases of the guild system have shown how freedom was slow to come. Members of the guilds enjoyed certain privileges. With the restriction of entry of craftsmen into guilds, production was divorced from the ownership of the means of production. The financing merchants became the owners and controller of production. Artisans came to be hired. Nonetheless skilled artisans were better paid.

The guild system, which was considerably more mobile than the feudal system, meant monopolistic control of trade and production. The wealthy merchants were, however, not of much account in the social scale. To attain social prestige they purchased land. For social prestige depended still on the possession of land. We can easily note the inertia in social valuations, though economic remuneration tended to show fair relationship with skill.

Under the domestic system of production there was increasing control of the owners of capital. Concentration of wealth meant concentration of power. There was mobility amongst the various classes. Merchants gained in importance due to their growing prosperity. And they could acquire gentility by purchasing land. In short gentility could henceforth be acquired by wealth. There was increasing scope for professions, with increase in credit facilities.

The concentration of wealth effected by the wise combination of landed interests, trading and industrial interests in England made possible the establishment of the factory system of production. Henceforth anybody who had abundance of capital and the necessary intelligence could rise to the top. Wealth determined one's rank. The rich mercantile class came to dominate the State. Increasing influence of skill and consequent wealth determined one's social position.

The progress of the Industrial Revolution strengthened the social tendencies initiated by the divorce of production from the ownership of the means of production. The cumulative effect of the Industrial and Agricultural Revolutions was a further concentration of wealth and power. The State came to be dominated by those who were in possession of wealth, namely the capitalist manufacturers. The capitalist manufacturer was yet obliged to purchase land to obtain social prestige. Only later it was found that landlords came to be of secondary importance. Industrial captains came to be at the helm of affairs. Then came the professions, which were afforded wide scope owing to the rise of new vocations as a result of increased credit facilities. Professions were rated high in the social scale for their skill as well as for the degree of independence enjoyed by them. Skilled labourers were not only better paid than ordinary labourers, but were also rated higher socially than the ordinary

labourers. Agicultural labourer was paid less and reckoned socially lower than industrial labourer.

The power and prestige of the industrialists was ever on an increase during a still later period i.e. by the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Agricultural occupations are valued less than industrial ones, increasing scope for mechanical workers. Differentiation of payment was made on the basis of skill. The share of salaried persons has increased. The share of earned incomes has increased proportionately to that of capital. This is due mainly to the skilled nature of the work performed by the salariat. Skill is properly recognised. Thus in 1938 amongst the salaried persons more than fifty-five per cent of their number earned more than £250 per year. Even amongst such persons those engaged in offices which were importantly connected with finance formed a larger proportion than the rest. Shop assistants are reckoned inferior to salary earners. Skill is valued economically as well as socially. The wage bill tends to remain stationary. But there is a positive increase in the earnings of salaried persons. One's social position is determined by occupation, skill and wealth.

Thus in the study of the English society we find a deep interrelationship between social status, skill and occupational position, and the remuneration received. And the interrelationship is so deep and persisting that we may almost speak of it as correlation.

In our study of the Indian society we were presented with a mixed system. It is a notable difference between the caste system and the feudal system that, though under both the systems birth determined status, under the caste system there was some choice in the matter of occupations. Thus there was scope for skill. It may also be pointed out that, though the social structure was pyramidal during the Mughal rule, nobility was not hereditary as it was under the feudal system, but it depended on the nature of employment. Though artisans had to seek patronage from the Court, skill was always highly valued. Systematic gradation of the people according to the nature of the work performed was the main feature of the social system during the Mughal rule. No scope for professions as independence was construed as rebellion.

The British hegemony over India resulted in the worsening of the economic condition of the country as a whole. However, the centralization of administration, development of communications; opening of India to external world, effected by the British meant increasing scope for professions. Many new vocations came into being. All this meant ever increasing recognition to skill.

Our study of the earnings in the public administration and services as well as in professions reveals clearly that men of highest ability are paid very highly and enjoy high social esteem. The factor of skill counts largely in determining the position of workers in all industries. We find how workers are systematically graded according to the degree of skill possessed by them, which in turn determines remuneration and social standing. The same tendency is seen to be at work in the case of artisans. The disparity between the socio-economic position of the industrial and agricultural worker can be explained, at least partially, in terms of skill.

In our study of the Soviet Society the most outstanding principle brought to our notice is that social status cannot long be divorced from skill. Thus the arbitrary equalisation of payment to skilled and unskilled

workers spelled disaster. Skill had to be rewarded with higher economic remuneration and high social standing. A regular hierarchy of recipients of amenities of life was created according to the nature of the services rendered. Clear cut distinction was made between the skilled and the unskilled operations. Social stratification and economic stratification went hand in hand. The Stalin Award was made for meritorious service. So there is a correlation between social status, skill and remuneration. Thus the managers of production enjoy the highest privileges, social as well as economic.

The study of the Soviet Society shows that even in a communistic society so long as skill is limited in a population, it will continue to be valued socially as well as economically and that the three—social status, skill and remuneration, will be correlated.

Our study of the three societies shows that in all modern societies —capitalistic or communistic—there is a significant correlation between social status, skill and remuneration. Moreover, the increasing importance given to skill, socially as well as economically, brings to our notice the fact that skill forms the bridge, as it were, between social status and remuneration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABRAM .. *Social Life in England in the 15th Century.* George Routledge and Sons Ltd., New York, 1909.

ADSHEAD, Lord. .. *New England Planning for the Future.* London, Fredrick Mullor Ltd. St. Bedford Row, 1941.

ALDEN, Sir Percy .. *Aspects of Changing Social Structure.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1937.

AISOPP, H. .. *An Introduction to English Economic History.* G. Bell and Sons Ltd., London, 1913.

ANSTEY, Vera .. *The Economic Development.* Longmans Green and Co., London, New York and Toronto, 1936.

ASHLEY, W. J. .. *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory.* Longmans Green and Co., Great Britain, 1931.

ASHLEY, W. J. .. *Economic Organisation of England.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1935.

BAGEHOT, Walter .. *The British Constitution.,* Thomas Nelson and Sons. London, 1872.

BALLARD, L. V. .. *Social Institutions.* D. Appleton Century Co. (The Century Social Science Series) New York and London, 1936.

BARNES, B. The Rt. Hon. George .. *Industrial Conflict.* Sir Issac Pitman and Sons Ltd., London, 1924.

BARNES, Harry Elmer .. *The History of Western Civilisation.* Harcot Brace and Co., New York, 1946.

De BASILY .. *Russia Under Soviet Rule—Twenty Years of Bolshevic Experience.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1938.

BAYKOV, A. .. *The Development of the Soviet Economic System.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1946.

BEER, M. .. *A History of British Socialism.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1940.

BEER, M. .. *Social Struggles and Modern Socialism.* Leonard Parsons, London, 1925.

BEER, M. .. *Social Struggles and Socialist Forerunners.* Leonard Parsons, London, 1924.

BEER, M. .. *Social Struggles and Thought.* Leonard Parsons, London, 1925.

BENSON .. *Old England Mid-Victorian and Victorian.* D. Appleton and Century, New York and London, 1937.

BERGSON, A. .. *The Structure of Soviet Wages—A Study in Socialist Economics.* Harward Economic Studies, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusets, 1944.

BERNARD .. *Social Control.* The Macmillan Co., New York, 1939.

BOOTH, Sir Charles .. *Life and Labour in London,* 1890-1900; *Second Series, Fifth Volume.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1903.

BOWLEY, A. L. (Ed.) .. *The Division of the Product of the Industry.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1921.

BOWLEY, A. L. (Ed.) .. *England's Foreign Trade in the Nineteenth Century.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1922.

BOWLEY, A. L. (Ed.) .. *Livelihood and Poverty.* Sir Ratan Tata Foundation University of London; G. Bell and Sons Ltd., London, 1915.

BOWLEY, A. L. (Ed.) .. *Some Economic Consequences of the Great War.* Home University Library—Thoronton Butterworth Ltd., London, W.C. 2, 1930.

BOWLEY, A. L. (Ed.) .. *Studies in the* 1924-38 *National Income.* Cambridge Press, Cambridge, 1942.

BOWLEY, A. L, & Sir Josiah STAMP .. *Three Studies in National Income Being the Division of the Product of Industry.* A. L. BOWLEY. *The Change in the Distribution of the National Income*—A. L. BOWLEY. *Thi National Income*—STAMP. Reprinted by the London School of Economics and Political Science (University of London), London, W.C. 2, 1938.

BOWLEY, A. L. *Wages and Income Since* 1860—*Wages and Income in the U.K.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1937.

BRIGGS, M. .. *Economic History of England.* University Tutorial Press, London, 1926.

BUCH, M. A. *Economic Life in Ancient India.* Arya Sudharak Press, Baroda, 1924.

BUCHANAN, Daniel, H. .. *The Development of Capitalist Enterprise in India.* Bureau of International Research Harvard University and Redcliffe College, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1934.

BURN, Sir Richard (Ed.) .. *Cambridge History of India,* Vol. IV—*The Mughal Period.* Cambridge at the University Press, 1937.

BURNHAM, James .. *The Managerial Revolution.* Pelican Books, 1945.

CAIRNS, H. .. *Law and the Social Order.* Kegan Paul Trench, Turbner and Co. Ltd., London. 1935.

CANNAN, EDWIN .. *A Review of Economic Theory.* P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., London, 1929.

CENTERS, Richard .. *The Psychology of Social Classes—A Study of Social Consciousness*—Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1949.

CARR, E. H. *The Twenty Years Crisis,* 1919-39. Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1940.

CARR, E. H. *The Soviet Impact on the Western World.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1947.

CARR-SAUNDERS, A. M. & D. Caradog JONES .. *A Survey of the Social Structure of England and Wales.* Oxford, 1937.

CARR-SAUNDERS & P. T. WILSON .. *The Professions.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1933.

CHAMBERLIN, WILLIAM Henry .. *Russia's Iron Age.* Duckworth, London, W.C. 2, 1935.

CHOKSEY, R. D. .. *Economic History of the Bombay Deccan and the Karnatak.* The Oriental Watchman Publishing House, Poona, 1947.

CILIGIA, A. .. *Russian Enigma.* G. Routledge, London, 1901.

CLAPHAM, J. H. .. *An Economic History of Modern Britain—The Early Railway Age.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1930.

CLAPHAM, J. H. .. *An Economic History of Modern Britain—Free Trade and Steel.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1932.

CLAPHAM, J. H. .. *An Economic History of Modern Britain—Epilogue—Machines and National Rivalries.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1936.

CLAPHAM, J. H. .. *An Economic History of Modern Britain—Machines andi National Rivalries with an Epilogue.* Cambridge University Press, Cambrdige, 1940.

COATE, Mary .. *Social Life in Stuart England.* Methuen and Co. London, 1925.

COATES, William, P. .. *From Czardom to the Stalin Constitution.* Allen and Unwin, London, 1938.

COLE, G. D. H. & POSTGATE, Raymond .. *The Common People*, 1745-1938. Methuen and Co. Ltd. London, 1938.

COLE, G. D. H. .. *Meaning of Marxism.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1948.

COLE, G. D. H. .. *The Next Ten Years in British Economic and Social Policy.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1929.

COLE, Margaret .. *Twelve Studies in Soviet Russia.* Gollancz, London, 1933.

Colin CLARK .. *A critique of Russian Statistics.* Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1939.

COX, Oliver Cromwell .. *Caste, Class and Race.* Double Day and Co., New York, 1948.

CROOME, H. M. & HAMMOND, J. L. .. *The Economy of Britain.* Christophers, London, 1947.

CUNNINGHAM, George .. *The Progress of Capitalism in England.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1916.

CUNNINGHAM, George .. *Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times. The Mercantile System, Part I.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1921.

CUNNINGHAM, George .. *Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times. The Mercantile System, Part II.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1921 .

DA'ETH .. "Present Tendencies of Class Differentiation"—*Sociological Review*, Vol. III.

DALTON, H. .. *Inequality of Income.* George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, 1935.

DAS, R. K. .. *India and a New Civilisation.* Nibaran Chandra Das Prabasi Press, Calcutta, 1942.

DESAI, A. R. .. *Social Background of Indian Nationalism.* University of Bombay Publications Sociology Series, No. 2, Bombay, 1948.

DICEY, A. V. .. *Lectures on the Relation between Law and Public Opinion in England.* (During 19th Century). London, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1917.

DICKINSON, H. D. .. *Institutional Revenue—A Study of the influence of Social Institutions on the Distribution of Wealth.* Williams and Norgate Ltd., London, 1932.

DIGBY, W. .. *Prosperous British India.* T. Fisher Union London, 1901.

DOBB, Maurice .. *Capitalist Enterprise and Social Progress.* George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, 1944.

DOBB, Maurice .. *Political Economy and Capitalism.* Georga Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, 1944.

DOBB, Maurice .. *Russian Economic Development Since the Revolution.* George Routledge and Sons Ltd., London, 1928.

DOBB, Maurice .. *Russian Economic Development Since the* 1917. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1948.

DOBB, Maurice .. *Soviet Planning and Labour in Peace and War.* George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, 1942.

DOBB, Maurice .. *Soviet Russia and the World.* Sidwick and Jackson Ltd., London, 1932.

DOBB, M. .. *Studies in the Development of Capitalism.* George Routledge and Sons Ltd., London, 1946.

DOROTHY, George M. .. *England in Transition.* George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, 1931.

DUTT, R. C. .. *Economic History of India Under Early British Rule.* London, Kegan Paul Trench Trubner and Co. Ltd., 1908.

DUTT, Rajni Palme .. *India Today.* Peoples' Publishing House, Bombay, 1947.

ENGELS, Fredric .. *Condition of the Working Classes in England* 1844. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1935.

ENGELS, Fredric .. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.* Charles H. Kerr and Co. Co-operative, Chicago, 1902.

FARBMAN, Michael .. *Russia's Five Year Plan.* New Republic Inc., New York, 1931.

FAY, C. R. .. *Great Britain from Adam Smith to Present Day.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1928.

FEDERN, Karl .. *The Materialist Conception of History.* Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1939.

FIELDON, Lionel .. *Beggar my Neighbour.* International Book House Ltd., Bombay, 1944.

FINNEMORE, Hohan .. *Social Life in England.* A. and C. Black Ltd., 4, 5, and 6 Soho Square, London, W. L. 1929 (i) 1930 (11).

FISCHER, Louis .. *Empire.* National Youth Publication, Bombay, 1946.

FRASER, L. M. .. *Economic Thought and Language.* A Critique of some Fundamental Economic Concepts. A. and C. Black Ltd., 4, 5, and 6 Soho Sq. London, W. 1, 1937.

FREED, Lan .. *Social Pragmatism.* Watt's, Co., 5 and 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet St., London, E.C. 4, 1948.

FRIEDMAN, E. M. .. *Russia in Transition.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., Museum St., London, 1933.

GADGIL, D. R. .. *Industrial Evolution of India.* Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London, 1944.

GADGIL, D. R. .. *Salaries of Public Officials in India.* Gokhale Instituta of Politics and Economics, Aryabhushan Press, Poona-4, 1931.

GALTON, Sir Francis .. *English Men of Science.* D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1875.

GALTON, Sir Francis .. *Hereditary Genius.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1925.

General Wage Census 1st Report. .. Prepared by Labour Office, Government of Bombay, Central Press, Bombay, 1935.

General Wage Census 2nd Report. .. Prepared by Labour Office, Government of Bombay, Central Press, Bombay, 1936.

General Wage Census 3rd Report. .. Prepared by Labour Office, Government of Bombay, Central Press, Bombay, 1937.

General Wage Census 4th Report. .. Prepared by Labour Office, Government of Bombay, Central Press, Bombay, 1939.

General Wage Census Part II .. Prepared by Labour Office, Government of Bombay, Central Press, Bombay, 1939.

GHURYE, G. S. .. *Caste and Race in India.* Kegan Paul Trench and Co., Ltd., London, 1932.

GIBBERD, K. .. *Soviet Russia.* The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Oxford University Press, London, 1942.

GIFFEN, Sir Robert .. *Economic Inquiries and Studies.* Two Vols. George Bell and Sons, London, 1904.

GINSBERG, Morris .. "*Interchange Between Social Classes*". (*Economic Journal*, Vol. XXXIX), Dec. 1929.

GINSBERG, Morris .. *Sociology.* Home University Library, Oxford, 1949.

GLASS, David .. *The Town—And a Changing Civilization.* The Twentieth Century Library, John Lane, The Bodley Head, London, 1935.

GLASSIER, Carrie .. *Wage Differentials.* Columbia University Press, New York, 1940.

GOLDENWEISER, A. A. .. *Early Civilization.* Alfred A. Khopj, New York, 1926.

GRANT, A. T. K. .. *Society and Enterprise.* George Routledge and Sons Ltd., London, 1934.

GRETTON, R. H. .. *The English Middle Class.* G. Bell and Sons Ltd., London, 1917.

GROSS, C. .. *The Gild Merchant. Two Vols.*, Oxford University Press, London, 1927.

GULL, E. M. .. *British Economic Interests in Far East.* Oxford University Press, London, 1943.

HAMILTON, C. J. .. *Trade Relations Between England and India.* Thacker, Spink and Co., Calcutta, 1919.

HAMMOND, J. L. & HAMMOND Barbara .. *The Bleak Age.* Revised Edition of 1947 in Pelican Books, London, Revised, 1947.

HAMMOND, J. L. & HAMMOND, Barbara .. *The Town Labour*—1760-1832. Longmans Green and Co., London, 1936.

HAMMOND, J. L. & HAMMOND, B. .. *The Village Labourer.* 1760-1832. Longmans Green and Co., London, 1936.

HAMMOND, J. L. & HAMMOND B. .. *The Skilled Labourer.* 1760-1832. Longmans Green and Co., London, 1919.

HAMPDEN, Jackson J. .. *England since the Industrial Revolution.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1936.

HAXEY, Simon .. *England's Lords.* Harrison Hilton Books, New York, 1939.

HECKER, JULIUS, F. .. *Russian Sociology.* The Columbia University Press, New York. Longmans Green and Co., Agents: P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., New York, London, 1915.

HENDERSON, H. D. .. *Colonies and Raw Materials.* Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs, No. 7 at Claredon Press, London, Reprinted in 1940.

HICKS, J. R. .. *Value and Capital.* The Claredon Press, Oxford, 1941.

HILTON, John .. *Rich Man Poor Man.* Sir Hailey Stewart Lectures, 1938. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1944.

HINDUS, Maurice .. *Humanity Uprooted.* Blue Ribbon Books, Inc. New York City, 1934.

HINDUS, Maurice .. *Russia Fights On.* Collins 48 Pall Mall, London, 1942.

HIRLEKAR, K. S. .. *Soviet Russia—*The Secret of her Success. Avanti Prakashan, Bombay, 1944.

HOBHOUSE .. *Morals in Evolution.* Chapman and Hall Ltd., London, 1929.

HOBSON, C. K. .. *Export of Capital—Studies in Economic and Political Science.* Constable and Co. Ltd., London, 1914.

HOBSON, J. A. .. *An Economic Interpretation of Investment.* The Financial Review of Reviews. 2, Waterloo Place, London, S. W. May 1911.

HOBSON, J. A. .. *Evolution of Modern Capitalism.* The Contemporary Sciences Series, Edited by Havelock Ellis, London, 1916.

HOBSON, J. A. .. *Imperialism—A Study.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1948.

HOBSON, J. A. .. *The Industrial System.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1910.

HODSON .. *Twentieth Century Empire.* Fabre and Fabre Ltd., 24 Russell Square, London, 1948.

HUBBARD, L. .. *Soviet Labour and Industry.* Macmillan and Co., London, 1942.

HUBBARD, L. .. *Soviet Trade and Distribution.* Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1938.

The Indian Central Banking Enquiry Committee Report .. The Manager of Publications, Government of India, Delhi, 1931.

Indian Society of Agricultural Economics. .. "Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics", April, 1948.

JONES, G. P. & POOL, A. G. .. *A Hundred Years of Economic Development in Great Britain.* Duckworth, 3, Henrietta St., London, W.C. 2, 1940.

JUDD, C. H. .. *Psychology of Social Institutions.* Macmillan Co. Ltd., New York, 1927.

KARPINSKY, V. .. *The Social and State Structure of the U.S.S.R.* Foreign Languagis Publishing House, Moscow, 1949.

KEIRSTEAD, B. S. .. *Essentials of Price Theory.* The University of Toranto, Toranto, Canada, 1947.

KEYNES, J. M. .. *The End of Laissez Faire.* Leonard and Virginia Wolf The Hogarth Press, London, W.C. 1, 1926.

KNOWLES, L. C. A. .. *Industrial and Commercial Revolution in Great Britain During the Nineteenth Century.* George Routledge and Sons Ltd., E. P. Dutton and Co., London and New York, 1924.

KRUEGER, E. T. & RECKLESS, W. C. .. *Social Psychology.* Longmans Green and Co., New York, 1931.

KUEZYNSKI, R. R. .. *Living Space and Population Problems.* Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs, No. 8. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1939.

KURSKY, A. .. *Russia Has a Plan.* Soviet News, Grand Bldg., Trafalgar Sq. London, W. C. 1945.

LAMBERT, J. M. .. *Two Thousand Years of Guild Life.* A. Brown and Sons, Saville St. Hull, 1891.

LANDTMAN, Gunnar, .. *The Origin of the Inequality of the Social Classes.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner and Co. Ltd., London, 1938.

LASKI, H. J. .. *Grammar of Politics.* London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1943.

LASKI, H. J. .. *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1943.

LENIN, V. I. .. *Imperialism—The Highest Stage of Capitalism.* Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., London, 1942.

LEVY, HERMANN .. *Economic Liberalism.* Macmillan and Co., Ltd., St. Martins St., London, 1913.

LINTON, Ralph .. *The Study of Man.* D. Appleton Century Co., New York, 1936.

LIPSON .. *The Economic History of England.* The Age of Mercantilism. A. and C. Black Ltd., London, 1931.

LIPSON .. *The Economic History of England.* Vol. I. The Middle Ages. Adam and Charles Black, London, W.1, 1945.

LORIA, Alchille (Translated by KEASBEY, L. M.) .. *Economic Foundations of Society.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1922.

LOWE, Adolf *Economics and Sociology.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., Museum St., London, 1935.

MACDOUGALL, William .. *Modern Materialism and Emergent Evolution.* Meltmen and Co., Ltd., 36, Essex St., W.C., London, 1929.

MACIVER, R. M. .. *Contribution of Sociology to Social Science.* Columbia University Press, New York, 1931.

MACIVER, R. M. .. *The Modern State,* Oxford, 1926.

MACIVER, R. M. .. *Society.* Farrar and Rinchart Inc. Publishers, New York, 1937.

MACIVER, R. M. .. *Web of the Government,* New York, 1947.

MAITLAND .. *Doomsday Book and Beyond.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1921.

MAJUMDAR, D. N. .. *The Matrix of the Indian Culture.* Nagpur University, The Universal Publishers Ltd., The Mall, Lucknow, 1947.

MANNHEIM, Karl .. *Diagnosis of our Time. Wartime Essay of a Socialogist.* Kegan Paul, Trench, Turner and Co. Ltd., Broadway House, Carter Lane, London, E.C., 1943.

MANTOUX, Paul .. *The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century.* Jonathan Cape, London, 1927.

MARRIOT .. *England Since Waterloo.* Meltenen and Co. Ltd, London, 1913.

MARX, ENGELS .. *Historical Materialism.* People's Publishing House, Sandhurst Road, Bombay, 1943.

MAYNARD, John .. *The Russian Peasant and Other Studies.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1943.

MAYO, Elton .. *The Social Problems of Industrial Civilisation.* Division of Research Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston, 1945.

MEREDITH, G. .. *England in transition,* George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, 1931.

MEREDITH, H. O. .. *Economic History of England.* Sir Issac Pitman and Sons Ltd., London, 1939.

MESS, H. A. .. *Social Structure.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1942.

MILNER, Fredric .. *Economics and Sociology.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1931.

MOFFIT .. *England on the Eve of Industrial Revolution.* P. S. King and Sons Ltd., London, 1925.

McMOHAN .. *Social and Economic Standard of Living.* D. C. Health and Co., New York, 1925.

MORELAND, W. H. .. *India at the Death of Akbar.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1920.

MORELAND, W. H. .. *From Akbar to Aurangzeb*—A Study in India on Economic History. Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1923.

MORRISON, Sir Theodore .. *The Economic Transition in India.* John Murray, Albermarle St., W. London, 1916.

MUKERJI, D. P. .. *Modern Indian Culture.* Indian Publishers, Allahabad, 1942.

MUKERJEE, Radhakamal .. *Economic History of India,* 1600-1800. Longmans Green and Co. Ltd., India, 1945.

MUKERJEE, Radhakamal .. *Foundations of Indian Economics.* Longmans Green and Co. Ltd., India, 1916.

National Industrial Conference Board Research Report .. *Wages in Great Britain, France and Germnay.* The Century Co., Publishers, New York, 1921.

NAOROJI, Dadabhai *Poverty and UnBritish Rule in India.* Swan Sonneschein and Co., London, 1901.

NIVEDITA, Sister .. *The Web of Indian Life.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1918.

NORTH, C. C. .. *Social Differentiation.* The University of North Columbia Press, Oxford University Press, London, 1926.

NORTH, C. C. .. *Social Problems and Social Planning.* MacGraw Hill Publications in Sociology. MacGraw Hill Book Co., London and New York, 1921.

NORTHROP, F. & C. .. *The Logic of the Sciences and Humanities.* Macmillan Co., New York City, 1948.

The Official Report of the British Trade Union Delegation. .. *Russia Today.* International Publishers, New York, 1925.

O'MALLY-(Edited by) .. *Modern India and the West.* Oxford University Press. Published under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1940.

PANDIT, Y. S. .. *India's Balance of Indebtedness.* Unwin Bros. Ltd., Great Britain, 1937.

PANIKKAR, K. M. .. *Hinduism and the Modern World.* Kitabistan, Allahabad, 1938.

PARES, Bernard .. *Russia.* Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1940.

PARSONS, Talcott .. *American Journal of Sociology.* Vol. XLV, No. 6. *An analytical approach to the theory of Social Stratification.*

PEAKE, Harold .. *The English Village—The Origin and Decay of its Community.* Benn Bros., 8, Bonveric St. London, 1922.

PILLAI, P. P. .. *Economic Conditions in India.* London, 1925.

POLANYI, Karl .. *The Origins of our Time.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1945.

POPPER, K. R. .. *The Open Society and its Enemies.* Two Vols. George Routledge and Sons, London, 1945.

POSTAN, M. M. .. *The Historical Methods In Social Science.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1939.

POWELL, Baden, B. H. .. *The Origin and Growth of Village Communities in India.* London, 1899.

PRATT, A. F. W. .. *National Affairs.* Adam and Charles Black, London, W. 1., 1939.

RAO, V. K. R. V. .. *An Essay in India's National Income.* 1925-1929. Allen and Unwin, London, 1939.

RAO, V. K. R. V. .. *National Income of British India,* 1931-32. Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1940.

RAO, V. K. R. V. .. *Taxation of Income in India.* Longmans Green and Co. Bombay, 1931.

RAPSON, E. J. (Ed.) .. *Cambridge History of India.* Vol. I. Ancient India. Cambridge at the University Press, 1922.

RENNER, Karl .. *The Institutions of the Private Laws and their Social Functions.* Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, E.C. 4., 1949.,

Report of the American Trade Union Delegation to the Soviet Union. .. Publication, New York, 1927.

Report of the Commission on Christian Higher Education in India, London, 1931.

Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India, Govt. of India, Central Publication Branch, Calcutta, 1931.

Report of the Textile Labour Inquiry Committee, Vol. I, Interim Report. .. Government Central Press, Bombay, 1938.

Report of the Textile Labour Inquiry Committee, Vol. II, (Final Report). .. Government Central Press, Bombay, 1940.

RIVERS, R. H. .. *Social Organisation.* Kegan Paul, London, 1932.

ROBERTSON, H. M. .. *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1933.

THE DIRECTOR OF ... 26 AUG 1969 GOVT. OF MADRAS

ROGERS, Thorold .. *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*
Vol. I. Oxford, 1866;
Vol. II. Oxford, 1865;
Vol. III. Oxford, 1881;
Vol. IV. Oxford, 1881;
Vol. V. Oxford, 1887;
Vol. VI. Oxford, 1887;
Vol. VII. Oxford, 1902.
Pt. 1
Pt. 2. 1902.

ROGERS, Thorold .. *The Economic Interpretation of History.* T. Fisher Unwin and Co., London, 1918.

ROPKE, Wilhelm, Translated from the German by Cyril, SPENCER .. *Civitas Humana—A Humane Order of Society.* William Hodge and Co. Ltd., London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, 1948.

ROSS, J. F. .. *A Social and Industrial History of England.* Mathews and Co., 36, Essex St., W.C. London, 1930.

RUSSELL, Bertrand .. *On Power.* George Allen and Unwin, London, 1939.

RUSSELL, Bertrand .. *Principles of Social Reconstruction.* George Allen and Unwin, London, 1923.

RUSSELL, Bertrand .. *Scientific Outlook.* George Allen and Unwin, London, 1931.

RUSSELL, B. & SCOTT, NEARING .. *Bolshevism and the West.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1924.

SARKAR, J. .. *Fall of the Mughal Empire.* Calcutta, 1932.

SCHLESINGER, R. .. *Soviet Legal Theory.* Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. Ltd., Carter Lane, E.C. 4, London, 1945.

SCHMOLLER, Gustav. .. *The Mercantile System.* Economic Classics Edited by W. J. Ashley, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1910.

SCHUMPETER, J. A. .. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1943.

SHAH, K. T. & KHAMBATTA, K. J. .. *Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India.* D. B. Taraporewalla and Sons, Bombay, King and Sons Ltd., London, 1924.

SHAW, G. B. .. *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism, Capitalism, Sovietism and Fascism.* Two Vols. Penguin Books Ltd., Middlesex, England, 1937.

SHIRRAS, G. F. .. *Poverty and Kindred Economic Problems in India.* Memorandum on Certain Economic Facts in regard to India with Special reference to the Problem of Poverty, Famines, Industries Taxation and the Balance of Payments in International Trade. Government of India, Central Publications Branch, Calcutta, 1932.

SHIRRAS, G. F. .. *Report on an Enquiry into Agricultural Wages in the Bombay Presidency Labour Office*, Government of Bombay, Govt. Central Press, Bombay, 1924.

SHIRRAS, G. F. .. The Science of Public Finance, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1936.

SHORE, M. J. .. *Soviet Education, Its Psychology and Philosophy.* Philosophical Library, Inc. 15, East, 40th St., New York, 1947.

SIMS, Newell Leroy .. *Society and Its Surplus.* D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1924.

SINHA, N. C. .. *Studies in Indo-British Economy Hundred Years Ago.* A. Mukharjee and Co., Calcutta, 1946.

SLOAN, Pat. .. *Russia Without Illusions.* Fredrick Muller Ltd., 29, Great James St. London, 1938.

SMART, William .. *The Distribution of Income.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1923.

SOMBART, Werner .. *A New Social Philosophy.* Princeton University Press, New Jersey, U.S.A., 1937.

SOMERVILLE, J. .. *Soviet Philosophy.* Philosophical Library Inc. 15, East, 40th St., New York, 1946.

SOROKIN, Pitrim .. *Contemporary Sociological Theories.* Harper and Bros. New York, and London, 1928.

SOROKIN, Pitrim .. *The Crisis of our Age.* E. P. Dulton and Co. Inc. New York, 1946.

SOROKIN, Pitrim .. *Social and Cultural Dynamics.* 3 Vols. American Sociology Series, American Book Co., 1937.

SOROKIN, Pitrim .. *Socialy Mobility.* Harper and Bros., New York and London, 1927.

SPENCER, M. K. .. *Soviet Russia—Its Socialism.* New Book Co., Hornby Road, Bombay, 1939.

STAMP, Sir Josiah .. *British Incomes and Property.* P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., London, 1927.

STAMP, Sir Josiah .. *Some Economic Factors in Modern Life,* P. S. King Ltd., London, 1929.

STRAUSS, E. .. *Soviet Russia.* John Lane. The Bodley Head, London, 1942.

SUMNER, William Graham .. *What Social Classes Owe to each Other..* New Haven Yale University Press, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London, 1925.

SWEEZY, Paul .. *The Theory of Capitalist Development.* Dennis Dobson Ltd., London, 1946.

TAWNEY, R. H. .. *Acquisitive Society.* G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., London, 1937.

TAWNEY, R. H. .. *Equality.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1931.

TAWNEY, R. H. .. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.* Penguin Series, Middlesex, England, 1948.

TEGGART, F. J. .. *The Processes of History,* New Haven, Yale University Press, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford, 1918.

TEGGART, F. J. .. *Theory of History.* New Haven, Yale University Press, London, 1928.

TOYNBEE, A. .. *The Industrial Revolution of Eighteenth Century in England.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1920.

TREVELYAN, G. M. .. *Social History of England.* Longmans Green and Co., U.S.A., Canada, 1942.

VEBLEN, T. .. *Theory of the Leisure Class.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1924.

VINOGRADOFF, P. .. *Villainage in England.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1892.

VISHVESVARAYA, M. V. .. *Planned Economy for India.* Bangalore Press, Bangalore City, 1934.

2 6 AUG 1969
GOVT. OF MADRAS, MADRAS

WADIA, P. A. & JOSHI, G. N. .. *The Wealth of India.* Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London. 1927.

Wages and the Unemployment in the Bombay Cotton Textile Industry. .. Departmental Report of the Labour Office. Government of Bombay, Central Press, Bombay, 1934.

WARD, Lester .. *Dynamic Sociology.* Washington, 1896.

WARD, Lester .. *Pure Sociology.* Macmillan and Co., New York. 1921.

WARNER, W. H. & LUNT, P. S. .. *The Social Life of a Modern Community.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1944.

WEBB, Beatrice and Sidney. .. *Industrial Democracy.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1920.

WEBB Sidney, & Beatrice. .. *Decay of Capitalist Civilization.* London, 1923.

WEBB Sidney, & Beatrice. .. *Soviet Communism—A New Civilization.* Vols. I and II. Longmans Green and Co., London, E.C. 4, 1936.

WEBER, A. E. .. *Growth of Cities in 19th Century.* Macmillan and Co., P. S. King and Sons, New York, London, 1899.

WEBER, Max. .. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of the Capitalism.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1930.

WEBER, Max. .. *Theory of Social and Economic Organisation.* (Translated from the German by A. R. Hendirson and Talcott Parsons). William Hodge and Co. Ltd., London, 1947.

WEDGWOOD, J. .. *The Economics of Inheritance.* Pelican Books Ltd., Middlesex, England, 1939.

WEISER .. *Social Economics.* George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1927.

WESTERMARK .. *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas.* 2 Vols. Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1924-26.

WHITE, L. W. & SHANHAN, E. W. .. *The Industrial Revolution and the Economic World of Today.* Longmans Green and Co., London, 1932.

WILMORE, A. .. *Industrial Britain.* George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd., London, 1930.

WOOLFE, Leonard .. *Economic Impirialism.* Swartmore Press Ltd., Oxford St. W.C. 1, New York, 1920.

WOOTAN, B. .. *Plan or No Plan.* Victor Gollancz Ltd., London, 1934.

DECCAN COLLEGE MONOGRAPH SERIES

1. *Panipat* 1761—by T. S. Shejwalkar. Crown 4to, pp. 141 and 9 maps. 1946. Rs. 12 [M 1].
2. *Anthropometric Measurements of the Marathas*—by Iravati Karve. Crown 4to, pp. 71 and 4 plates. 1948. Rs. 8. [M 7].
3. *Studies in the Historical and Cultural Geography and Ethnography of Gujarat*—by H. D. Sankalia (being the Thakkar Vassonji Madhavjii Lectures for 1944 at the University of Bombay). Crown 4to, pp. xvi+245 and 3 maps. 1949. Rs. 15. [M 11].
4. *Etched Beads in India*—by M. G. Dikshit. Crown 4to, pp. viii+79 and 19 plates. 1949. Rs. 10. [M 13].
5. *Report of the Excavations at Brahmapuri (in Kolhapur)*—by H. D. Sankalia and M. G. Dikshit. Crown 4to, pp. xvi+154+37 plates. 1952. Rs. 30. [M 15].
6. *Stone Age and Pleistocene Chronology in Gujarat*—by F. E. Zeuner. Crown 4to, pp. 46+11 plates. 1950. Rs. 8. [M 17].
7. *Phonemics of Old Tamil*—by C. R. Sankaran. Crown 4to, pp. vi+71+2 plates. 1951. Rs. 8. [M 18].
8. *Anthropometric Measurements of Maharashtra*—by I. Karve, and V. M. Dandekar. Crown 4to, pp. vi+134+2 maps +24 plates, 1951. Rs. 12. [M 20].
9. *Nagpur Affairs*—(Selections from the Menavali Daftar)—by T. S. Shejwalkar. Royal 8vo, pp. lv+450. 1954. Rs. 15. [M 25].
10. *Godavari Palaeolithic Industry*—by H. D. Sankalia. Demi 4to, pp. ii+59+49 figs. 1952. Rs. 12, [M 28].
11. *Kinship Organisation in India*—by Iravati Karve. Crown 4to, pp. x+304. 1953. Rs. 15. [M 41].
12. *High-School Students in Poona*—by I. P. Desai. Crown 4to, pp. x+123. 1953. Rs. 10. [M 44].
13. *Excavation at Nasik and Jorwe*—by H. D. Sankalia and S. B. Deo. Crown 4to, pp. xv+177+135 plates and 94 drawings. 1954. Rs. 45. [M 45].

DECCAN COLLEGE DISSERTATION SERIES

1. *Historical Grammar of Old Kannaḍa*—(based entirely on the Kannada Inscriptions of the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries A.D.)—by G. S. Gai. Royal 8vo, pp. xvi+232. 1946. Rs. 15. [D 2].
2. *Cultural History from Vāyu Purāṇa*—by D. R. Patil. Royal 8vo, pp. xviii+348. 1946. Rs. 15. [D 3].
3. *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits*—by M. A. Mehendale. Royal 8vo, pp. xi+345. 1948. Rs. 21. [D 5].
4. *Juvenile Delinquency and Destitution in Poona*—by Mrs. G. N. Ruttonsha, Demi 8vo, pp. 180. Rs. 8. [D 6].
5. *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṁśa*—by G. V. Tagare. Royal 8vo, pp. xviii+454. 1948. Rs. 21. [D 8].
6. *Verbal Composition in Indo-Aryan*—by R. N. Vale. Royal 8vo. pp. xii+324. 1948. Rs. 18, [D 9].

7. *Stone Age Cultures of Bellary*—by B. Subbarao. Royal 8vo, pp. viii+62. Rs. 8. [D 12].
8. *Citations in Śābara Bhāṣya*—by D. V. Garge. Royal 8vo, pp. xii+312. 1952. Rs. 16. [D 19].
9. *Ṛgvedic Legends through the Ages*—by H. L. Hariyappa. Crown 4to, pp. xxii+123-330. 1953. Rs. 15. [D 30].
10. *Evolution of Malayālam*—by A. C. Sekhar. Crown 4to, pp. viii+220. 1953. Rs. 16/-. [D 31].
11. *Nominal Composition in Indo-Aryan*—by G. V. Davane. [D 32]. (*in press*).
12. *The Judicial System of the Marathas*—by V. T. Gune. Crown 4to, pp. xxxv+391 +2 maps +1 plate. 1953. Rs. 20/-. [D 37].
13. *Linguistic Peculiarities of Jñāneśvarī* (with index verborum)—by M. G. Panse. Royal 8vo. pp. xiii+655. 1953. Rs. 20/-. [D 38]
14. *A Concordance of Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas* (with Index of Meanings)—by G. B. Palsule. Crown 4to, pp. iv+203. 1955. Rs. 12. [D 51].
15. *Pleistocene Studies in the Malaprabhā Basin*—by R. V. Joshi. Crown 4to, pp. 116 and IX plates. 1955. Rs. 15/- [D 52].

DECCAN COLLEGE HAND-BOOK SERIES

1. *Prehistory in India*. Four Broadcast Talks on Early Man—by F. E. Zeuner. Crown 8vo., pp. 39+16 plates. 1951. Rs. 2/8/-. [H 22]
2. *Archaeology and Indian Universities*—by H. D. Sankalia. Demi 8vo., pp. 17. 1952. As. 8.
3. *The Grammatical Structure of the Dravidian Languages*—by Jules Bloch (Authorised English translation from the original French by R. G. Harshe.) Demi 8vo, pp. xxxiv+127. 1954. Rs. 6. [H 42].
4. *An Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism* (2nd edition)—by S. M. Katre. Demi 8vo, pp. xvii+148. 1954. Rs. 6. [H 46].
5. *Dhvanivicāra* (Marathi Phonetics)—by N. G. Kalelkar. Crown 8vo., pp. 13+194. 1955. Rs. 5/-. [H 47].
6. *Lectures in Linguistics*—by O. L. C. Aguilar. Crown 8vo., pp. ix+128. 1954. Rs. 4. [H 48].

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. New Indian Antiquary, Volumes 1-9. Rs. 20 per Volume.
2. V. S. Sukthankar Memorial Edition, 2 Vols. Rs. 30 per set.